

William H. Jernee, to be postmaster at Jamesburg, Middlesex County, N. J.

Robert W. Hinton, to be postmaster at Lumberton, Pearl River County, Miss.

Reuben S. Collett, to be postmaster at Vernal, Uinta County, Utah.

James M. Ranstead, to be postmaster at Bremen, Marshall County, Ind.

Charles D. Davidson, to be postmaster at Whiting, Lake County, Ind.

Solomon R. McKay, to be postmaster at Troy, Lincoln County, Mo.

William B. Nichols, jr., to be postmaster at Lafayette, Chambers County, Ala.

Felicie Louise Delmas, to be postmaster at Scranton, Jackson County, Miss.

Edwin N. Bailey, to be postmaster at Britt, Hancock County, Iowa.

Albert R. Kullmer, to be postmaster at Dysart, Tama County, Iowa.

George W. Summers, to be postmaster at Gunnison, Gunnison County, Colo.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, January 16, 1901.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ACTION OF GENERAL CHAFFEE IN CHINA.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Military Affairs to submit the following privileged report on House resolution 315.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, respectfully requested to inform the House, at the earliest date practicable, what, if any, protest, objection, criticism, or suggestion General Chaffee or any other American officer in China made or offered concerning looting or other action or conduct deemed inhuman, dishonest, dishonorable, or improper; to whom directed or addressed, and on account of what facts or information; and how received and replied to, and with what result; and what, if anything, the War Department did or caused to be done, or suggested to General Chaffee or other officer or officers, person or persons, or ordered or directed him or anyone else to say or do in reference thereto, with dates, particulars, and details covering the incident or incidents fully and circumstantially.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the reading of the report and the letter from the Secretary of War accompanying it.

The Clerk read as follows:

REPORT.

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred resolution entitled "Action of General Chaffee in China," report the same back to the House with the recommendation that it do lie on the table. The letter of the Secretary of War is made a part of this report:

WAR DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, January 2, 1901.

SIR: I return herewith House resolution No. 315, making inquiry regarding protests, objections, criticisms, and suggestions by General Chaffee, or other American officers, concerning looting in China, transmitted by you for information and remark.

The subject to which this resolution relates is so intimately connected with the diplomatic relations and negotiations concerning the critical and delicate conditions now existing in China that I think it would be very inadvisable to attempt any public statement or invite public discussion upon any branch of the subject at this time. The time will doubtless come when the whole subject will be a proper matter for a report, but that time clearly has not yet come. An answer to the resolution would require me to call upon General Chaffee for a detailed report, and it is probable that no answer could be received before the end of the present session of Congress.

Very respectfully,

ELIHU ROOT, Secretary of War.

Hon. JOHN A. T. HULL,
Chairman Committee on Military Affairs, House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the resolution lie on the table?

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] introduced the resolution and could have called it up before the committee made the report. I understand he would like a little time. If the gentleman will state how much, I should be happy to yield to him.

Mr. DE ARMOND. A few minutes.

Mr. HULL. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Missouri may have five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] have five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, I shall not consume all of the five minutes. The resolution was suggested by an item which appeared in the papers, very creditable, I think, as to the course of the commander of the American troops in China. The resolution was prompted by a desire to get information in regard to that

incident wherein it was stated that General Chaffee had rebuked or had protested against the conduct of an officer of a foreign government with respect to the course of affairs in China. It indicated that the responsibility for the barbarity and dishonesty prevailing to a large extent in that unhappy country at this time does not rest with the American commander or the American soldiers.

The reason given by the Secretary of War in his letter to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, in answer to the letter of inquiry from that gentleman, seems to give sufficient reason, I think, and as the committee thought, why this resolution ought not to be pressed. With this statement I am entirely content that the recommendation of the committee be followed.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the resolution lie on the table?

The question was taken and the resolution was laid on the table.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill 13189, the river and harbor bill.

The motion was agreed to. Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. HOPKINS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union is now in session, pursuant to the direction of the House, for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13189, and the Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Improving Missouri River above Sioux City: Continuing improvement and maintenance, including snagging, \$40,000.

Mr. THOMAS of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 14, page 75, after the word "River," insert "at and."

Mr. BURTON. I have no objection to that.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Improving Missouri River below Sioux City: Continuing improvement, \$300,000, which shall be expended in the improvement of such portions of said river as the Secretary of War may designate; and such portions of said appropriation as he may deem necessary may be expended for the improvement of tributary streams of said river heretofore under improvement under the direction of the Missouri River Commission.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting in line 20, on page 75, immediately after the word "designate," the following:

"Provided, That whenever the Missouri River is caving its banks and destroying or threatening to destroy valuable real estate or materially change its proper channel, the Secretary of War is hereby authorized, upon application of any person or persons owning real estate fronting said river, in his discretion, to construct dikes, wings, revetments, jetties, or such other works as in the opinion of the Secretary of War may be necessary or sufficient to prevent such caving or erosion of the banks thereof and confine and retain said river to its proper channel. In the matter of the construction of such dikes, wings, revetments, jetties, or other works as above described, the said Secretary of War may receive, without cost to the Government, and use in the construction of such improvements such material and labor as may be furnished by any person or persons interested in or benefited by the same: Provided further, That the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, authorize and permit any person or persons owning real estate on said river to construct and maintain on their own account, and at their own proper cost and expense, such dikes, wings, revetments, jetties, or other work, as above described and contemplated, all work so done, however, to be done under the supervision, direction, and control of the said Secretary of War."

Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Chairman, I trust that the merit which I think I see—

Mr. HEPBURN. If the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOUGHERTY] will yield for a moment I would like to offer at this time an amendment relating to the same matter. It is to insert after the word "river," in line 20, page 75, the words "and in maintaining the stability of its banks."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa offer that as an amendment to the amendment?

Mr. HEPBURN. No, sir; as an amendment to the paragraph. I want to have it pending during the argument of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK. I wish the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] would state his amendment again.

Mr. HEPBURN. I wish to insert after the word "river," in line 20, page 75, the words, "and in maintaining the stability of its banks;" so that the clause will read, "shall be expended in the improvement of such portions of said river and in maintaining the stability of its banks, as the Secretary of War may designate."

Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Chairman, I trust that the merit which I think I see in the amendment I have submitted may become apparent to the committee, that it will receive no opposition from the chairman of the River and Harbor Committee, and that it may be eventually adopted. The purpose and effect of the proposed amendment is not to lay any additional burden of

obligations upon the Government in the matter of Missouri River improvements, but it is designed to enable the Secretary of War to construct vastly greater improvements without any additional cost. There is nothing in the amendment which makes it in any sense obligatory upon the Secretary of War to make any expenditure or do any work at all, but when any person or persons owning real estate on the river front petition the Secretary of War to construct a wing, dike, revetment, or other work of a similar character at a designated point where the river threatens to change its course, or where erosion of the banks occurs, then the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, comply with such request and cause to be constructed such needful and proper improvements, and accept from interested persons, to be used in such improvements, such labor and material as they furnish without cost to the Government.

Many of the owners of real estate on the river will very gladly avail themselves of an opportunity to supply the necessary willows, stones, and timber for piles, which constitute, Mr. Chairman, principally, or in fact about all, the material used in the construction of work of this character.

It seems to me that provisions of this character may well serve to aid in the construction of such improvements and may enable the Secretary of War to accomplish four times the amount of work heretofore accomplished with the same amount of appropriation available. In other words, the \$340,000 which this bill carries for the general improvement of this river for its full length may, under the operation of this proposed amendment, be made to do more than \$1,000,000 worth of work; and at the same time, Mr. Chairman, will prevent the erosion of the bank and consequent changes in the channels of the streams, and also reclaim millions of acres of the most fertile soil on the continent.

The concluding paragraph of this proposed amendment provides that the Secretary of War may in his discretion authorize or permit owners of real estate on the river front to construct such improvements as heretofore mentioned at their own cost and expense; but it requires such work to be prosecuted subject always to the supervision, direction, and control of the Secretary of War.

Now, the justice and propriety of this provision certainly need no elaboration. It may be claimed that this privilege now belongs to individuals; but there are instances where such work has been undertaken by private persons and they have been stopped or prevented by the officials of the Government. If the right does accrue to individuals, I submit that it is perhaps only a constructive right.

Now, Mr. Chairman, upon comparison with other streams the Missouri River is entitled to serious consideration.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CLARK. I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. DOUGHERTY] have five minutes more.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Chairman, the commerce upon this river may not only be of State and interstate importance, but it may be of national concern. From the source, in central Montana, of this great river, called by the aborigines the "Big Muddy," down to its junction with that monarch stream of the continent known to the Indians as the "Father of Waters," and thence down to the Gulf of Mexico, we have a natural inland waterway of greater length than any other on the globe. From the confluence of the Missouri River with the Mississippi near St. Louis up to Fort Benton, Mont., a distance of nearly 3,000 miles, this was counted, until a comparatively recent date, a navigable stream, and the same steamers that plied the Lower Mississippi River plied also the greater portion of the Missouri River.

For this long distance the Missouri River runs through and by the side of seven of the greatest and most productive States in this Union. Upon its banks are situated hundreds of progressive towns and cities varying in size and commercial importance. Notable among such cities I may cite the city of Great Falls, Mont.; Bismarck, N. Dak.; Pierre, S. Dak.; Omaha, Nebr.; the great cities of Sioux City and Council Bluffs, in the State of Iowa; Atchison and Leavenworth, Kans.; St. Joseph, Kansas City, Jefferson City, and we may well add St. Louis, the great metropolis of the central West. These cities are situated upon the banks of this great stream. And in the valley of the Missouri River there are millions of acres of more fertile and productive soil than any on the globe, not excepting even the most favored region in the famed valleys of the Nile. The development of the mineral, agricultural, timber, horticultural, and live-stock interests of this vast territory tributary to the Missouri River is destined, in my opinion, to make it in time one of the nation's great arteries of commerce.

And, gentlemen, those who come after you may well wonder at your refusal and neglect to preserve this stream to the uses of commerce and navigation. If abandoned now and suffered to pursue its wonted way through the yielding soil in its valleys, not only will wreck, ruin, and devastation come to this land of incalculable aggregate value, but the reclamation of the river for purposes of

navigation will be rendered immeasurably more difficult and expensive. Instead of being abandoned, as is contemplated, it should be accorded the most skillful attention at the hands of scientific engineers, with proper appropriations at their command.

Among other reasons why this river is not now more extensively used for the purposes of navigation is the fact that several great railway systems parallel it, so to speak, but under all existing conditions this great river is to-day a standing menace to the extortion of railway corporations, and serves to keep freight rates to all river points within due bounds and reasonable moderation.

The navigable streams of the country are the only transportation highways of the people, and in the interest of the people, to protect them against the greed and extortion of incorporated monopolies, they should be maintained. While I do not charge it to be a preconceived purpose on the part of the River and Harbor Committee, yet upon examination of this bill the fact is disclosed that a vast majority of the sum carried in this appropriation accrues to those States of Republican politics.

Must we conclude that imperial Missouri, the recognized Gibraltar of Democracy and the chiefest champion of constitutional liberty, must, because of political faith and affiliation, suffer her great waterway—which traverses the very heart of the State from east to west—to be treated as a nonnavigable stream, and, forsooth, have further appropriations for its improvement withheld?

Coming, as I do, from the Middle West, as a Missourian justly proud of my native State, anxious to contribute in some small degree, at least, to her present advancement, future greatness, and lasting glory, I protest against the treatment accorded this great stream by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

The Missouri River is peculiarly the people's highway of the middle West. It is not owned and controlled by grinding corporations, and with proper care and attention it may be made of incalculable value in the matter of encouraging, developing, and transporting the vast trade and commerce of those great States that are laved and refreshed by its turbid waters.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I regard this amendment as extremely objectionable. In the first place, it is not clear what is meant by it. This is the way it starts:

Provided, That whenever the Missouri River is caving its banks and destroying or threatening to destroy valuable real estate or materially changing its proper channel, the Secretary of War is hereby authorized, upon application of any person or persons owning real estate fronting said river, in his discretion, to construct dikes, wings, revetments, jetties, or such other works as in the opinion of the Secretary of War may be necessary.

Now, the recommendation of the committee is that we look to a policy which stops those large appropriations of money for the protection of the banks of alluvial streams. We make that recommendation because we feel assured that in a few years, if we continue that class of appropriations, they will overshadow the other appropriations in the bill; because, further, we believe that they are not proper appropriations in a bill of this nature, and they are very doubtful from a standpoint of expediency and propriety. It is extremely doubtful, I say, whether the Federal Government ought to make these appropriations.

I had understood that it was the general sentiment of the House to favor that recommendation of the committee, though I stated that I desired the fullest discussion. I want to say again to the friends of river and harbor improvements that if they desire that this bill be kept what it should be, they had better join in any movement to exclude such items. It appears that some \$11,000,000 has been expended upon the Missouri River; that the larger share of that sum has been expended for objects just like that named in this amendment—to prevent the caving of banks threatening to destroy valuable real estate, etc. Now, then, the committee for which I speak do not believe that that should be done. Does this committee or does the House of Representatives desire to continue this extravagance? Are they willing that this lavish expenditure shall go on without result? We do not so recommend. We say it should be discontinued.

The paragraph in the bill appropriates \$300,000, which shall be expended in the improvement of such portions of said river as the Secretary of War may designate. The amendment under consideration proposes certain methods in which this money may be expended. Now, what is the inference to be derived from that? Why, Mr. Chairman, the result will be, if this amendment is adopted in its present form—because the phraseology is undoubtedly wrong—that the Secretary of War will simply say, "Why does Congress give me this \$300,000?" Manifestly the purpose is to continue the work heretofore done, to shore up the banks and go on with the same character of work that has been carried on there for so many years, to continue the same methods of expenditure in this regard which have been so unproductive in the past.

I had understood that it was the intention of the gentleman that the Secretary of War was not to expend the money of the Government for this purpose, but certainly that is not the language of the provision he has drawn. I think he has been unfortunate,

therefore, in the phraseology of the amendment, if I understand the purpose he had in view.

Now, I would like to ask the gentleman if he would consent to add to his amendment a proviso in substance that no part of said appropriation shall be expended for the purpose to which I have referred?

Mr. DOUGHERTY. I would like to ask the gentleman this question in response to his, premising my question with the statement that the only expenditure contemplated by the amendment is to be made by the Secretary of War. The purpose of the amendment is to authorize individuals to furnish material and labor necessarily entering into the construction of such works as are indicated in the amendment, and the only expense to the Government would be the transfer of the boats, the pile drivers, and matters of small expense like that, while all of the material and part of the labor is furnished by individuals. It certainly seems that that small proportion of expense should be borne by the Government.

This amendment does not provide for any expenditure excepting such as may be advisable, in the language of the amendment, in the discretion of the Secretary of War. It does not take anything from the appropriation heretofore made. It simply changes the method of applying it.

And now, if the gentleman from Ohio will permit me further, there is another inquiry I would like to make. I find on page 61 of the bill, beginning with line 9, the following language:

The sum of \$5,401.86, being the balance of an amount heretofore appropriated for the survey of the Licking River in Kentucky, or so much thereof as may be necessary and remaining unexpended, is hereby diverted and made available, to be expended, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, in restoring the bank of the Ohio River and roadway between Covington and Ludlow, Ky.

This is a similar proposition—

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I must decline to regard the item the gentleman has read as a precedent in this bill. It was an item which was put into the bill not through any agency of mine, and I was not in harmony with it. I did not make the proposition at all; and if the gentleman, when this bill was being considered at that point, had risen and made objection to the provision, I should certainly have made no opposition to its going out.

But in response to this question of the gentleman, if all the expenses to which he refers—relating to the pile drivers and small matters of that kind—

Mr. DOUGHERTY (interrupting). That is all.

Mr. BURTON (continuing). And trivial expenses of that character were solely involved, then the gentleman in his amendment was certainly, as I have said before, exceedingly unfortunate in the phraseology he used. Now, what is that phraseology?

Mr. DOUGHERTY. May I suggest this question—

Mr. BURTON. It states here that the Secretary of War is authorized to construct—not to transfer—pile drivers to aid in constructing—not to carry material, but to construct—dikes, wings, revetments, jetties, or such other works as in the opinion of said Secretary of War may be necessary or sufficient to prevent such caving or erosion of the banks thereof and confine and retain said river to its proper channel. There is a broad authority, amounting to a command, to go on there, not in any partial way, but with the full amount of this appropriation, and to continue the very erroneous system which has been in vogue.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. May I ask the gentleman a further question?

Mr. BURTON. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. Upon application of parties in interest, in the event that the Government boats and machinery were transferred to a given point to do certain work, and the labor was performed by private individuals owning property and those employed by them, and the materials furnished for the construction of a given work, the mere fact that it was under the supervision, direction, and control of the Government would make it Government work, and it would be constructed by the Government, and that is all that that provides for. It simply means that the Secretary of War, in his discretion, may authorize this to be done, on such terms as he may approve.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman is decidedly in error in that statement. Here is an appropriation of \$300,000, and a statement made as to what the Secretary of War may do, that he may do certain things. The discretionary power amounts to a command. If it was desired that he should merely exercise a certain amount of supervision there, it would have been very easy to have said so; but a great deal more has been said. Now, I have no objection, and I want to say one further thing here in the matter of the construction of such dikes, wings—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURTON. I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. I ask that the time of the gentleman from Ohio be extended five minutes.

Mr. BURTON. I offer an amendment that seems to me meets the case.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. An amendment to the amendment?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. Will the gentleman allow me?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman offer that as an amendment to the amendment already pending?

Mr. BURTON. To the amendment already pending.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask you a question before that amendment is read, for information. If this amendment of my colleague [Mr. DOUGHERTY], with the amendment of the chairman, is voted down, then will it be a proper parliamentary performance to offer another amendment to this very same section?

The CHAIRMAN. It will. The Clerk will report the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert in line 20, page 75, after the word "designate," the following:

"And such dikes, or other construction as may be necessary to protect public or private property, may be located in said stream and upon the banks thereof, by abutting owners and municipalities: *Provided*, That they do not interfere with the proper navigation of said river: *And provided further*, That the same are approved by the Government engineer having the improvement of said river in charge."

Mr. BURTON. That is a substitute, Mr. Chairman, rather than an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment just read.

Mr. BURTON. Now, this provision in the matter of the construction of—

such dikes, wings, revetments, jetties, or other works as are herein specified, the said Missouri River Commission or Secretary of War may receive, without cost to the Government, such material and labor as may be furnished by such person or persons owning real estate on said river.

While no doubt it was offered in the utmost good faith, it is open to the assertion that it is put in here to give to this body the idea that the people out there are going to come forward and give the material and give the labor. Whoever heard that it was necessary to solemnly pass an act of Congress in order to authorize the people along the Missouri River to give something to the Government. It is not necessary for us to do any such absurd thing as that. If they desire to cooperate with the engineers, if they desire to do the work, if they desire to furnish the material, they can do so, and we do not have to write it down in the statute book.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BURTON. Certainly.

Mr. RUCKER. Does the amendment just offered by the chairman of the committee provide or contemplate that the Government may use these boats and pile drivers in this work without charge to the adjacent landowners?

Mr. BURTON. No; it does not.

Mr. RUCKER. Would the gentleman be willing to add that to his amendment?

Mr. BURTON. If the gentleman will furnish his phraseology, I can answer that question in a minute.

Mr. RUCKER. I did not catch the exact reading, but as I understood it I would like to have that provision, that in such work the boats, pile drivers, etc., used by the Government may be employed without cost to the landowners.

Mr. BURTON. I am willing to add that in this language:

Provided, That such equipment as is now owned on the Missouri River, available for this purpose, may be used for work of this nature in connection with work done or material furnished by the owners of abutting property.

Mr. RUCKER. Say for hauling the material, driving piles, etc.

Mr. BURTON. Oh, yes; add the expense of such operation to be paid.

Mr. RUCKER. If the gentleman will do that—

Mr. BURTON. As the small expense of operating is to be paid by the private owner, I am willing for a time that the expense of operating should be paid by the Government.

Mr. RUCKER. I should be glad if the gentleman will go as far as he can.

Mr. BURTON. I would be willing to add "the expense thereof to be paid by the persons applying for the work."

Mr. RUCKER. I thought you said you would be willing for the Government to pay the expense of the work.

Mr. BURTON. I would be willing to have the Government pay it for two years, or a limited time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would suggest to the gentleman that he present his amendment in writing.

Mr. BURTON. I will have it drawn in a very few minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment of this section so that the appropriations can be used for the purpose of giving stability to the banks of this river. I do not believe there will be any immediate benefit to navigation, but I believe, from what I have heard from gentlemen who have favored other appropriations, that there will be indirect benefit. We all know how a large portion of alluvial soils are undermined and

carried down the Missouri River, and that they are deposited in the Mississippi River, and that they constitute, in part, the sand bars in that river that we have to move, and that if we can prevent the sand from going down we can do away with the necessity of its later removal, and in that way—and I think in that way only—this will be an aid to navigation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is not a new departure. This bill is full of propositions of this kind relating to other streams. I find on page 61 there is a provision in lines 14, 15, and 16 that the appropriation "is to be used in the discretion of the Secretary of War in restoring the bank of the Ohio River;" also, an appropriation on page 72 of \$20,000 "for the maintenance, repair, and riprapping of the natural and artificial banks along the eastern shore of the Mississippi River." Again, in another paragraph I find "\$70,000, or so much of it as may be necessary to protect the bank of the Mississippi River." But there is another instance, much more notable, where the appropriation is extraordinary, authorizing an appropriation for the improvement of the Mississippi River directly of \$2,500,000, with the possible appropriation of \$5,000,000 in addition.

It will be remembered that it was stated by the gentleman from Ohio yesterday that it was the object of the commission to secure a uniform depth of 9 feet from Cairo to the sea. He said further that that work was being prosecuted on the old method of dredging—that substantially the new methods of the Mississippi River Commission had been abandoned, and they had gone back to the old method of dredging, aided by the building of levees to hold the banks of the river.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have taken the trouble to make a little calculation. You all know that there is at all times and in every place of the current channel of the Mississippi River at least a depth of 7 feet. There never has been a bar, I think, where it has been less than that, and there are not to-day twenty places in the Mississippi River where the depth is less than 9 feet. But I have assumed there is a uniform depth of 6 feet. To secure 9 feet, you must remove 1 yard of silt in order to get the 9 feet.

I have made my calculation on the basis of a channel of 240 feet. That would be 80 yards. It would, with 1,760 yards to the mile and 500 miles, make a total of 74,400,000 cubic yards. The gentleman told us yesterday or earlier in the debate—the gentleman from Mississippi—that one of the modern dredges would remove 5,000 cubic yards in an hour. I have seen a statement of where one, on a trial, removed 10,000 cubic yards of sand in one hour. But take the statement of the gentleman, and suppose there are 500 miles of sand bars to be removed.

The gentleman from Mississippi will tell you that there is not a hundred miles of sand bars to be removed in length extending up and down the river. But suppose there are 500? That would make a gross total of 74,000,000 yards. One dredge excavates 5,000 yards per hour, or 50,000 yards per day, and five dredges will excavate 250,000 yards per day, or 74,400,000 yards in 282 days. One dredge, I am told, costs \$500 a day to operate, and five dredges will cost \$2,500 a day, or \$905,000 for 282 days. Add the cost of five dredges at \$100,000. It was stated once before a committee of which I am a member that that was the cost of one of the improved Bates dredges. Put it at \$100,000, and we have a total of \$1,205,000 as the total cost of dredging the channel, as I have told you before, for 80 yards wide and 500 miles long.

This bill, as I have said, carries an appropriation for the Mississippi River Commission of \$7,500,000. Deduct this cost of completing the channel so that it will meet the expectations of the gentleman from Ohio and give 9 feet in depth, 240 feet wide, the whole length of the river, and you have a remainder of \$6,295,000. What is that immense sum for? It is in this bill for the care of the banks of the river and for elevating these banks so as to protect the private property of people living on that river.

For the present I am not quarreling with that use. I am simply trying to suggest that if it is wise to do it there, it may be in other places, and trying further to suggest that gentlemen are mistaken when they tell us they are eliminating this class of appropriations from this bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is an important matter. The gentleman from Ohio may say that anybody may at his pleasure, at any place or time, make the improvements that will protect his property from encroachment on the Missouri River. I deny it. I say it is within the power of the Secretary of War to remove whatever the citizen himself may do, without he first can secure authorization from that officer. It has been done time and again, and will be done again. I suggest to the gentleman that it is a criminal offense, if there is navigation, for any person to undertake to change the current, to invade the stream, notwithstanding it may be essential to protect his own property. We ought at least to have the power and privilege on this great stream where there is no commerce, where there is no traffic, to protect our own property from its incursions.

I suggest that it is most essential. Every man familiar with that stream knows that throughout the great valley of 25 miles in

width in places it wanders at will, destroying that farm, magnificent in its character yesterday, and to-day a waste. We want something done. We think the Government ought to do what it proposes to do for the residents near the great improvement in Illinois, what it does for Tennessee, what it does in Arkansas, and in other States. Let this money be used for the protection from the erosion of the banks of the river.

I have here a statement taken from a newspaper published in Nebraska last Saturday:

DOES NOT KNOW HIS STATE—M'KNIGHT LIVES IN IOWA OR NEBRASKA, BUT WHICH?—CURIOUS EFFECT OF ONE OF THE LITTLE ECCENTRICITIES OF THE MISSOURI RIVER—OMAHA NOTES.

OMAHA, NEBR., January 11, 1901.

It has never been legally determined whether Solomon McKnight is a resident of Iowa or Nebraska. No one knows, in the eyes of the law, in which of the two States his farm lies, and it is this uncertainty that may result in a money lender's loss of \$300, and cause McKnight to be ahead that sum.

In 1856 the Missouri River flowed over the strip of ground where McKnight's farm is now located. The farm was the river's bed. At the present time the stream runs a good distance to the east, so that an observer unacquainted with the vagaries of the stream would say that the farm is a part of Nebraska. A few years ago McKnight borrowed \$100 from J. J. Gravatte, agreeing to pay \$300 in the event the law had to be invoked to secure payment. Suit was brought, as the obligation is long over due. Notice was served on McKnight in Nebraska. His attorneys contend that he is a resident of Iowa. If this is true, the service is illegal and the case must be dismissed without recovery for the plaintiff.

Judge Vinsonhaler heard the affidavit of J. D. Patterson, of Papillion, at the morning session of court, specifying that he was the county surveyor of Sarpy County for a good many years, and that he knows the river changed its course gradually. The importance of the assertion is that if it can be proved the stream did not change its channel very quickly the court, if it follows the decision of the supreme court in the East Omaha case, will hold that the farm is a part of this State. If the change was a rapid one the farm is a part of Iowa. The court reserved its decision until next week.

I have pointed out to the House an instance where a town in my district a few years ago was upon the border of the Missouri River. To-day it is 8 miles away. I have seen a railroad track lying on the borders of that stream moved four times in a year. The Burlington and Missouri River Railroad Company has removed one of its depots six times because of the encroachment of the river. Something ought to be done, and the only question is whether it can be done in this way. My contention is that we are in the line of precedents; that there are precedents given us over and over again in this bill, and that we have had precedents in every one of the appropriations we have made for the Mississippi River Commission, that grand aggregate of \$41,000,000, without the seven and a half millions in this bill, that have been given to increase, not the navigation of the Mississippi River, but the habitable character of the plantations upon its banks. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for fifteen minutes on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked by the gentleman from Missouri for fifteen minutes on this proposed amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. CURTIS. Has the gentleman from Missouri any objection to having the amendments reported again?

Mr. CLARK. No; I would like to have it done, but I do not want it taken out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Kansas that the gentleman from Missouri offered an amendment, and then the gentleman from Ohio offered a substitute.

Mr. CURTIS. I would like, Mr. Chairman, to have both amendments read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, both amendments will again be reported.

The Clerk again read both amendments.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, Robert Burns denominates the toothache as "the hell of all diseases." Evidently the well-beloved poet had never had the grip, or he would have remodeled his opinion; and while I ought to be in bed to-day instead of being here, the matter that is pending before the House now is of so much importance to the people I represent and to millions of other people I thought it was my duty to be here. We might as well be perfectly frank with each other. A large portion of the enormous sum carried in this bill is for the protection of private property. The truth is that the preservation of Government property and the protection of private property are so interlaced in the appropriations and in the very nature of things that notwithstanding the committee has done the best it could, it could not possibly separate them.

I am most heartily in favor of the amendment of my colleague [Mr. DOUGHERTY]. I would have offered it myself if he had not. It is in these words:

Amend by inserting in line 20, on page 75, immediately after the word "designate," the following:

"Provided, That whenever the Missouri River is caving its bank and destroying or threatening to destroy valuable real estate or materially change its proper channel, the Secretary of War is hereby authorized, upon application of any person or persons owning real estate fronting said river, in his discretion, to construct dikes, wings, revetments, jetties, or such other works as in the opinion of the Secretary of War may be necessary or sufficient to prevent such caving or erosion of the banks thereof and confine and retain said river to its proper channel. In the matter of the construction of such

dikes, wings, revetments, jetties, or other work, as above described, the said Secretary of War may receive, without cost to the Government, and use in the construction of such improvements such material and labor as may be furnished by any person or persons interested in or benefited by the same: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, authorize and permit any person or persons owning real estate on said river to construct and maintain, on their own account and at their own proper cost and expense, such dikes, wings, revetments, jetties, or other work as above described and contemplated, all work so done, however, to be under the supervision, direction, and control of the said Secretary of War."

If we can not get Mr. DOUGHERTY's amendment, I am for the substitute offered by the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, on the sensible theory that a half loaf is better than no bread.

THE MISSOURI RIVER.

"The Missouri River is not navigable and the Mississippi ought not to be" is a saying which I have heard attributed to the Hon. Thomas Brackett Reed, the most brilliant epigrammatist of this age, or of any age since the days of Alexander Pope, and the most sarcastic American statesman since John Randolph shuffled off this mortal coil.

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors seems to have adopted this proposition as their own, notwithstanding the fact that there is no truth in the first half of it and no sense in the last half. [Laughter.] The Missouri River is navigable. The Mississippi River not only is navigable, but will be and should be—

Forever and forever;
As long as the river flows,
As long as the heart has passions,
As long as life has woes.

If another pound of freight is never carried upon either of those mighty streams, still it would be the part of wisdom to maintain their navigability as a regulator of freight rates; for the very fact that they can be navigated keeps freight rates from soaring sky high.

The other day my able and distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] propounded the astounding theory that boating on the Missouri River had dwindled to the vanishing point on account of what he called "the great and unusual slope" of that turbulent stream.

Does he believe that there has been any notable change in the conformation of the earth's crust in that part of the continent within the last fifty years? Is the source of the Missouri River any farther above the level of the Mississippi now than it was when Robert Fulton invented the steamboat? Have the mountains of Montana lifted their lofty heads any nearer to heaven, or has the bed of the Father of Waters sunk any closer to the center of the earth within his recollection, or even within human memory? Does he think that the "slope" of that river is any greater now than when steamboating was in its palmy days and when hundreds of thousands of passengers and countless tons of freight went up and down from St. Louis to Fort Benton in those gorgeous "floating palaces" which were the pride and glory of the Western country?

Does he believe that the Missouri River "slopes" both ways? [Laughter.] While I listened to his annual speech—pleasant because an old acquaintance; familiar to the ears as household words by reason of its frequent iteration—I concluded that he must harbor that wild hallucination, otherwise his theory of "slopes" sinks into repulsive nothingness, as Rider Haggard's "She," for it stands to reason and to nature that if the "slope" of the Missouri River impedes boating upstream it expedites it downstream, ex necessitate, and in that way exactly evens up the whole thing. [Laughter.]

The learned gentleman's theory as to "slopes" is about on a par with Mark Twain's mathematical demonstration that if the Mississippi River continues to shorten itself for a given number of years at the rate it has been proceeding on that line for the last one hundred and fifty years, Cairo and New Orleans will be jammed together as one city and the Mississippi River will stick out several hundred miles over the Gulf of Mexico.

It must be confessed that the Missouri is a rapid, rushing river, impatient of control, difficult to confine within bounds, but, nevertheless, it is susceptible of being made either a great artery of commerce or the regulator of freight rates.

But the committee practically abandon it and refuse to do anything of moment for the teeming millions along its banks. They say that it is not the business of Congress to appropriate money to prevent the erosion or caving in of banks, although the preservation thereof is one of the most effective methods of preserving the navigable condition of any stream.

Most assuredly, if Congress will not appropriate money to prevent that omnivorous and insatiable stream from eating up the rich riparian lands, Congress ought at least grant permission to the owners to protect their own property from destruction and themselves and their wives and children from bankruptcy, which permission is given in the pending amendment.

My constituents are vitally interested in the adoption of this amendment

There is no richer agricultural plot of ground under the sun than the district which I have the honor to represent.

It skirts the Mississippi for 130 miles, straddles the Missouri, and has in it the mouths of four other rivers navigable by act of Congress. I love to call it the rich Mesopotamia of our western world.

It contains hundreds of thousands of acres of bottom lands more fertile than the valley of the Ganges or the delta of the Nile.

To show how productive these Missouri River bottom lands are I will tell you what actually happened. It is the plain, unvarnished truth, though it sounds like extravagant fiction. The owners, when they rent those lands, take two-fifths of the corn for rent. In the flush times at the close of the civil war some of the farmers in that way realized more than \$26 per acre annual rental on their lands.

Yet, many of my constituents write me that at the present rate in a few years all those wondrously rich lands will be forever destroyed and that the Government will neither help the owners nor let them help themselves—a sort of vicious dog-in-the-manger policy. My constituents tell the exact and painful truth. They have started in on several occasions to build the necessary works to save their lands, but invariably the Government pounced down upon them and stopped them on the theory that they were interfering with navigation.

But, strange to say, when those same owners ask the Government to improve the navigation of the river the Committee on Rivers and Harbors declare that the river is not navigable. It is and it isn't. Now you see it and now you don't. [Laughter.] A species of Governmental shell game.

Most clearly, as a matter of common sense and of common justice, if Congress will not appropriate money to protect these magnificent lands from destruction, it ought to cheerfully grant the owners the poor boon which they crave—of leave to save them themselves.

We are expending vast quantities of blood and treasure to secure new lands in the Orient as future homes for our children. Why not preserve the homes which we already have in the very heart of the continent? [Applause.] If old Ben Franklin was correct when he enunciated the great economic theory that "a penny saved is a penny earned," is it not equally true that "an acre of land saved is an acre of land acquired," especially when that acre is in the alluvial bottoms of the Mississippi and the Missouri? The money which we have spent, which we are spending, and which we are about to spend in the Philippines would suffice to build granite dikes 20 feet high from Alton to the head waters of the Missouri River, and furnish a current deep enough and broad enough to bear upon its bosom the commerce of the world, and would preserve as homes for our children and our children's children millions of acres of marvelously rich land in a dozen great States.

A Missouri poet, George W. Ferrel, has written the following splendid verses about the Missouri River:

I.

When youth was crowned with flowers of spring,
And robins could not help but sing;
When step was agile, eyes were bright,
And there were dreams of pure delight,
I, then a lad without pretense
And vested in all innocence,
First saw thy rippling currents run
Beneath the kisses of the sun.
I watched them at the morning hour
In sinuous sweep or subtle power
Speed eastward on their shining way
Toward the gleaming gates of day.
No hand to hold them, none to check,
They dwindled to a misty speck
In distance down the tireless stream
As strangely as a baseless dream.
And still they came and vanished far
Beneath the early morning star,
As ceaseless as the human tide
Since guilty Eve and Adam died.

II.

At evening, when the sun was red,
God's glory all around him spread;
When voices of the night were near,
Half whispering as though in fear,
I've seen him fling a cloth of gold
As rich as any king's of old.
Upon thy bosom, broad and free,
With a magician's witchery.
Enthralled and held by dreamy trance
As in the ghostliest romance,
I've seen the shifting phantoms leap
In beauty's power or terror's sweep,
Or gliding hither, here and there,
Elusive as the ambient air,
With fabled forms and shapes grotesque
Like figures in an arabesque.
They made no sign, they had no tongue,
They faded whence they flashed and sprung,
And left me, as forevermore,
A pilgrim on that shadowy shore.

III.

O mighty river, full of moods
As leaves in Vallombrosa's woods,
Thou hast a frown, thou hast a smile,
For every minute, every mile!
Thy depths enlock a thousand years
Of glad times and bitter tears;
Of harvest's songs and famine's wails,
Of tragic scenes and lovers' tales.
Interpreted by one who knows
Thy language as thy water flows,
Thou art a volume filled with lore
From fountain head to either shore.
The God who wrought thy wrinkled face
And set thy current's rapid pace,
Who smote the mountain rock and sent
Thee rushing through a continent,
Hath buried deep and buried well
Beneath thy bosom's ceaseless swell
A thousand stories stern and true,
A thousand legends linked with you.

IV.

In dreaming on these things at night
I catch from fancy's flaming flight
The echoes of the Indian's song
Upon thy wave that floats along;
I see the trapper in his tent
Beneath the starry firmament;
I hear once more the round wheels plash
Through billows broad and floods that flash;
I see those palaces in pride
Bear up against the turbid tide
Full-freighted to the eager West—
A world of wealth upon thy breast;
I hear the cannon roar afar
Along thy banks in days of war;
I see the thirsty cavalry
Dip deep beneath thy troubled sea;
And then the sun of peace serene
Smiles down upon thy borders green—
No more upon thy mighty flood
The boom of guns, the stain of blood.

V.

Flow on, O river, toward the sea,
Flow far and fast and grand and free
From where the golden sunsets are
By island green and sandy bar!
The great bluffs with their hoary heads,
The meadow, as it smiles and spreads,
The gloomy forests dark and wide,
Watch over thy unfettered tide.
The generations, one by one,
May perish with the passing sun;
Their very records all may fade
With temple, tower, and colonnade,
But still thy stream shall murmur low
And leap and flash and sing and flow
By height and town, by cliff and isle,
In stormy mood or gentle smile,
Until the very hand of Him
Shall dry the fountain at its brim
And stay thy course forevermore
By fallen crag, deserted shore.

THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER.

The permanent deepening of the Mississippi is a great national work which will be an incalculable blessing to the country, and the whole country. One can not read, even at this late day, without a thrill of patriotic pride and pleasure Thomas Jefferson's declaration that "The Mississippi must flow unvexed and unfettered to the sea." That was the pregnant prophecy of the glorious fact that we would become a vast continental power.

Congress should unquestionably and unhesitatingly appropriate money enough to maintain a channel in the Mississippi wide enough and deep enough all the year round to float ocean steamers, which would carry the commerce of the great valley of the Mississippi to the uttermost ends of the earth, without the trouble and expense of unloading and reloading. It would be money well spent from every conceivable point of view.

It would not only regulate freight rates to the seaboard, but would increase the commercial importance of every city, town, and village between the Alleghenies and the Rockies. More than that, it would, by saving freight charges, add to the value of every acre of land, of every bushel of wheat, corn, oats, rye, potatoes, and fruits, and to every bale of hay, and to the value of every horse, mule, cow, hog, and sheep, and would enhance the value of every day's labor of every man, woman, and child from Pittsburg to Denver and from Lake Itasca to the Gulf of Mexico.

I am not much disposed to complain of the members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors because they have taken especially good care of their own States, for it is written in a very old book that "If any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel." I also remember that Mark Twain, the illustrious Missourian, says, "Human nature is very strong, and we all have a heap of it in us." Evidently the members of the River and Harbor Committee form no shining exceptions to Mark's general rule. But I submit, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that while the members of this committee were making such a liberal distribution of the pork they ought to have given me at least a good

rasher of breakfast bacon in the \$50,000 appropriation that I ask for the harbor of Hermann. [Laughter and applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]
Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I venture a suggestion or two to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] with a great deal of diffidence. I see that he has studied the question of navigation and hydraulics and understands it thoroughly. He has overcome a difficulty that engineers have never yet been able to overcome to their satisfaction. He has discovered that the slope of a river and the extraordinary currents that may result from an excessive slope do not interfere with navigation, because while it may be difficult to get up, yet you can slide down so much easier that the thing is balanced and you have a complete equipoise. [Laughter.]

As boys, we used to think there was a great deal of delight in sliding downhill. We would even draw a sled back for the pleasure of the swift motion downward. But that plan has never yet been adapted by men to transportation, as I understand. According to the gentleman's theory, Niagara Falls is not an impediment to the navigation of the Niagara River. It might be very difficult to get up, but you would come down so fast that the thing would be equalized. [Laughter.] In view of the fact that there is no navigation and no commerce on the Missouri River, probably the gentleman's view of the subject may be absolutely correct.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that we ought to have this amendment, and I want to say, in a word, that I hope the members of this House will vote not only for this amendment, but will give the authorities the right to secure stability to these banks. I do not care about the phraseology of the amendment. I hope the committee will give that authority and that they will then double the amount reported in the bill.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I think the proposition should be clearly before us. There are three pending amendments. The first is the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOUGHERTY]. Then there is a second, the one proposed by the committee or its chairman, which is a substitute for that. Then there is the third, the one proposed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], that on page 75, after the words "said river," in line 20, there shall be added the words "and in maintaining the stability of its banks."

Just briefly upon this amendment. We ought not to undertake this proposition of maintaining the stability of the banks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Ohio that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa is not yet in shape to be voted on.

Mr. BURTON. Then I ask which of these propositions is to be voted upon first?

The CHAIRMAN. The first proposition to be voted upon will be the substitute by way of an amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] to the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOUGHERTY].

Mr. BURTON. I think the committee clearly understand the questions involved, and so, Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the way of a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that that may be again reported.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I understand the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio is a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The CHAIRMAN. It takes the place of the amendment, and covers the same ground.

The substitute was again reported.

The question was taken, and the substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri as amended by the substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. HEPBURN. I now desire to offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 20, page 75, after "river," insert "and maintain the stability of its banks."

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, just a moment. That is important in order to give complete force to the section. That necessity is not done away with, I will submit, by the amendment that we have already adopted. That does not authorize any expenditure upon the part of the Government, except the use of its machinery and appliances that it now has. Three hundred thousand dollars can not be used without we give this authority, and I hope the committee will favor the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. HEPBURN. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 68, noes 33.
Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers on that.
Tellers were ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] will please act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 52, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

So much of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved July 5, 1884, as provides for the creation of a commission to be called the Missouri River Commission, and prescribes the manner of appointment, the compensation, the powers, the duties, the expenditures, and the reports thereof, be, and the same is hereby, repealed from and after June 30, 1901. And said commission shall prepare and submit through the Chief of the Engineer Corps of the Army to the Secretary of War, to be by him transmitted to Congress, a full and detailed report of all their proceedings and actions since the date of their last report, and of all such plans and systems of work as may now be devised and in progress and carried out by them, and of all such additional plans and systems of works as may be devised and matured by them, with full and detailed estimates of the cost thereof, and statements of all expenditures made by them, and shall on said 30th day of June, 1901, transfer to and place under the control of the Secretary of War, or such engineer officers as he may designate, all such vessels, barges, machinery, and instruments, and such plant or other property as may then be provided, devised, or in use on said river, or on the Gasconade and Osage rivers, in the State of Missouri, from appropriations heretofore made for such rivers, or other sources, in their possession or under their control.

During the reading of the above,

Mr. SHACKLEFORD said: I want to ask permission to amend the section that was under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will conclude the reading of the paragraph.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Missouri that the Clerk reports that the amendment offered by the gentleman is to the paragraph preceding the one that the Clerk was reading, and, under the rules, the committee can not go back to that without unanimous consent.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. There was so much confusion that I did not know the paragraph the Clerk was reading. I had given notice of an amendment, it is at the desk, and I do not wish to discuss it. I therefore ask unanimous consent that we return to the paragraph to which the amendment is proposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to return to the paragraph preceding the one just read. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out the word "three," in line 18, page 75, and insert in lieu thereof the word "six;" so as to read "\$900,000."

Mr. BURTON. I trust no discussion is necessary on that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. One minute. I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that the amendment he has sent to the Clerk's desk is not an amendment to the amendment, but proposes an amendment to another section.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. No, sir. My amendment is an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman, because it strikes out "six." The two propositions ought to be considered together.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that his colleague has offered an amendment to a section on page 75, and the amendment offered by the gentleman is offered to page 76.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. But I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the two propositions ought to go together. The one proposes to increase the appropriation for the Missouri River Commission from \$300,000 to \$900,000, and my amendment merely leaves the commission in.

The CHAIRMAN. The proposition of the gentleman is to strike out the Missouri River Commission?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. No; to leave it in.

The CHAIRMAN. It strikes out the provision of the bill regarding it.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That has no relation to the amendment of the gentleman's colleague from Missouri.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Well, I can offer it later.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 19, noes 47.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now report the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Missouri.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all of page 76 and lines 1 to 3, inclusive, on page 77.

Mr. BURTON. Does the gentleman desire to discuss that subject further?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Just for one minute.

Since the committee has refused to increase the appropriations asked for in the amendment just voted down, I think it proper for me to withdraw this amendment if I can get unanimous consent to do so. If the commission is to be continued, it is quite plain that \$300,000 is not sufficient for its work, because the \$300,000 which this bill carries for the Missouri River is barely sufficient for protecting the improvements already made. In order to continue the improvement, it would be necessary to increase the appropriation. But since that proposition has been voted down, I beg leave to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman withdrawing his amendment just offered? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

Improving Gasconade River, Missouri: For maintenance, \$10,000.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

Strike out in line 15, page 77, after the word "Missouri," the word "For" and insert "Continuing improvement and for."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

Improving Osage River, Missouri: For maintenance, \$10,000.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

Strike out in line 17, page 77, after the word "Missouri," the word "For" and insert "Continuing improvements and for."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at the end of line 18, page 77, after the word "dollars," "for completion and maintenance of Lock and Dam No. 1 on Osage River the sum of \$20,000."

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I come from that unfortunate section of the West which has been overlooked in the river and harbor bill. In the district I represent is the Osage River. Other Congresses have made appropriations for the construction of a lock and dam on that stream, as has been provided in this bill for a number of other streams of the country. The chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors will not retort to me that the statistics show that there is no commerce on the river. On the contrary, it does carry a considerable commerce, and that for a section of the country where there are no railroads. Lock and Dam No. 1 has been almost completed. Owing to a flood last year there was some destruction of it, and it requires the addition of an appropriation of \$20,000 for its completion.

I applied to the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and he said to me that he preferred I should send to him in writing whatever I had to say rather than to take the time of the committee, as the committee could not give time to hear it. These great States up there have no member on the committee. We had to rest on the tender mercies of the gentlemen who are on the committee from other sections of the nation. I obtained from the engineer in charge the statement that \$20,000 was needed for the completion of the lock and dam and sent it to the committee, but I find they have made no appropriation for it. I hold in my hand a statement from the Chief of Engineers that the condition of the lock and dam is such that an additional appropriation will be necessary to complete it, and I ask the chairman of the committee, and I ask this House, considering that we have no railroad and must rely on the Osage River for transportation, if we can not have the \$20,000 put on the bill to complete that lock and dam?

The chairman of the River and Harbor Committee will not deny that it ought to be done, and the members of the committee will not deny it. I defy one of them to rise and say that this amendment ought not to be made. But they say, Mr. Chairman, "If we give you the amendment, which we know you ought to have, other gentlemen will demand that they, too, shall have an amendment allowed here, and we must stand by the committee, the commerce to the contrary notwithstanding; the needs of the country be what they may, we must stand by the River and Harbor Committee, or our piece of pork will be taken out of the bill." Now, I ask the House if it is not fair that I should have the amendment which I have asked for? Otherwise that improvement will stand there virtually uncompleted for two more years because the committee will not allow the amendment, which the chairman knows ought to be put into the bill, for fear somebody

else will rise on the floor and ask an amendment too. I ask the chairman of the committee to remember that I come from a section of the country where there is no representative on the River and Harbor Committee.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors gathers from the reports pretty well that the gentleman from Missouri comes from a district that has received more in the way of appropriations than practically all the other districts between St. Louis and Kansas City. In regard to many of the provisions on certain reaches they might have been better scattered over the river. So I do not think there is great occasion for complaint on the part of the gentleman as to the treatment he has received in his locality.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I would ask the gentleman, the chairman of the committee, if he undertakes to say that the appropriations to which he alludes as having gone to that section of country have been expended on the Osage River?

Mr. BURTON. I will say that I had reference primarily to the Missouri. No one can complain of the treatment that the Osage River has received from this committee. There was a hearing on it two or three years ago, in which I know several of us were very much impressed as to the necessity of water communication on that stream. It is peculiarly located. There is very little opportunity to construct railways along parallel to the banks by reason of the physical conformation of the surface. We made the provision for locks and dams at an expense of over \$200,000. We thought that a proper thing to be done.

Now, by reason of very extensive floods, it is at a late hour reported to us that the work can not be done within the estimate. That, in the first place, is a character of report to which we always give very careful attention. It is a sign either that the figuring has been imperfectly done, that some one has blundered, or that some catastrophe has occurred, as perhaps has been the case here, preventing work from being done at the price at which it was estimated. In the second place, we have a rule that we ought to follow—if we do not follow it, we do not know where we are. It is to the effect that however much we may hear in the way of outside information, from the statements of members, from letters of engineers, even from letters of the Chief of Engineers, stating that a certain amount is required, we ought not to make and can not make the appropriation asked for without an official estimate. This rule has worked very great hardship in a number of cases. I have been myself a believer in a provision which was inserted in the emergency act of June 6, 1900, to the effect that a certain sum should be placed in the hands of the Secretary of War and Chief of Engineers for discretionary disposition under very strict limitations.

Now, I presume it is true that they do need the additional \$20,000 in this case. I know also that there are at least twenty other localities in the country where their urgencies are quite as great; and if we were to allow this item to come in it would not only be opening the door for a score of others, but it would be violating a rule which we ought not to violate in our procedure. The Senate is not governed altogether by the same rules as ourselves. I have made no suggestion in any prior case that that would be the proper body in which to insert an item of this kind. But they are occasionally relieved from inconveniences in the way of rules which should rest upon us with binding force.

Thus, partly because of the injustice to other localities and partly because it would involve the infraction of a rule which we ought not to violate, this amendment, I submit, should not prevail.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. SHACKLEFORD, it was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Improving Puget Sound and its tributary waters, Washington: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to submit the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "dollars," in line 14, on page 80, insert the following: "Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, Washington: For maintenance and repairs, \$18,500; for improvement, \$25,000; total, \$43,500."

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment which I explained to the House a few days ago. I have noticed the regular precision with which every amendment to this bill opposed by the committee has been voted down. I believe I can have this amendment inserted in the Senate, and I am satisfied that then I can get the chairman of the committee to assent to it in conference. Therefore I shall deprive the Committee of the Whole of the satisfaction of voting down the amendment, and therefore withdraw it.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JONES] that the conference committee will deprive the gentleman of the "satisfaction" arising from our agreeing to an amendment which the Senate may add. At the same time I do not want to forecast any opposition.

I will say in regard to this report that the division of projects is usually very clear in the Engineer's report; but the first examination of this project and the first reexamination did not convince me that anything at all was required here. It would seem that the trouble was rather due to the lack of clearness in stating the division line between different portions of the channel. There is, I will say, a simple way in which this matter may be taken care of—by including it in the project for Grays Harbor proper. I understand, however, that the gentleman from Washington has withdrawn his amendment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Certainly.

The Clerk read as follows:

Improving the North Fork of Lewis River, Washington, in accordance with the approved project, \$5,000.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert on page 81, after the word "dollars," in line 5, the following:

"Improvement of Neah Bay, Washington, as a harbor of refuge in accordance with the report submitted in House Doc. No. 139, second session Fifty-fifth Congress, \$200,000: *Provided*, That a contract or contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete said project, to be paid as appropriation may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$911,907.50, exclusive of the amounts herein appropriated."

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the point of order upon that amendment until the gentleman from Washington has explained it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this project is one of the most important and most deserving that could be presented to the committee to be included in this bill, and, in my judgment, is not subject to any objection made by anyone to any of the other provisions of the bill.

A preliminary survey was ordered for this project some time ago, and report was made to the Chief of Engineers, in which it was recommended that the work should be pursued. A survey and estimate was made in pursuance of the order and submitted to the Chief of Engineers, who transmitted the report and findings of his subordinate officers to the Secretary of War, who, in turn, transmitted this recommendation or estimate to the Speaker of the House of Representatives last January.

Now, while it is true that the Chief of Engineers does not make recommendations in express terms in reference to these matters, and usually submits the report of his subordinates as an estimate, yet in his transmission to the Secretary of War it seems to me that in the case under consideration he has come nearer to making a recommendation than in any report of his that I have seen; and I desire to read what General Wilson says in his letter to the Secretary of War transmitting the report of the local officers who made the examination. He says that Captain Taylor, the local engineer, says in his report:

In my opinion there is no river and harbor work now in progress in this State or contemplated, as far as my knowledge extends, which is of so much importance to the general commerce of the State as the construction of a harbor of refuge at Neah Bay.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me he could not make a much stronger recommendation than that for a specific work. Between Vancouver Island, in British Columbia, and the State of Washington, connecting the waters of the Pacific with the Gulf of Georgia and Puget Sound, is the Strait of San Juan de Fuca, and at the extremity of this strait is what is known as Neah Bay. It is at this point that we desire to make the improvement which is contemplated in the amendment that I have offered.

Through the waters of the Straits of San Juan de Fuca passes all the commerce from Puget Sound, including a great deal of commerce not only from the State of Washington, but from Montana, from Dakota, from the State of Minnesota, from the State of Wisconsin, and from almost all of the Northern and Northwestern States. Commerce passes through these waters to the Upper Yukon, to St. Michael, to Nome, China, Japan, Australia, and all the ports of the world.

Through this strait passes an immense amount of tonnage. I was interested the other day, in the discussion of this bill, in hearing a statement that on the Ohio River the annual tonnage amounted to about 17,000,000. You will find from the report of the engineers that from 1895 until 1897 there passed through the Straits of Fuca 5,555,072 tons of commerce, and in the next two years—that is, from 1897 to 1899—there passed through these same waters 6,121,717 tons, or an increase of 300,000 tons each year, on an average; and there has passed through last year nearly 6,000,000 tons, so that this is one of the great commercial highways of the world.

All of the tonnage on Puget Sound from Seattle, Tacoma, Everett, Whatcom, and all of the ports along that great body of water must pass through these Straits of Fuca. And not only passes all the commerce of that region of country, but I may say, all of the commerce of the United States practically that goes into that extreme northwestern region to the outside world, passes through these straits.

Now, when vessels are passing along that strait the weather may be fair and favorable at point of departure, and yet when they reach the mouth of the harbor they may find a storm raging. Sailing vessels have no place of refuge to which they can enter under such circumstances. The disasters resulting from this cause from 1874 until 1894, according to the report of the engineers were 108. From 1894 to 1897 there were twenty-odd more, and since that time several others have taken place.

The local engineer at Seattle in his report of December 30, 1899, referring to this matter, uses this language:

The telegraphic communication with Cape Flattery is very frequently broken during the winter, and in that case the condition of the weather at the entrance is not known even when the vessel starts from Port Townsend. As, on account of the high mountain range between Puget Sound and the ocean, the character of the weather on the sound at any time is apt to be a poor guide as to what it may be on the coast. Under the existing conditions, with no safe harbor within many miles, a vessel once at the entrance of the straits will almost invariably put to sea, no matter what the storm may be, and take the chance of clearing land rather than take the long tow back. With steam vessels the same is true, only to a lesser extent, as they make the passage to the entrance in less time and can more readily turn back if they desire to. They also run less risk of being blown on to Vancouver Island in a southwest storm—the prevailing direction of winter storms.

Mr. CUSHMAN. I ask that the time of the gentleman be extended five minutes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I only want two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the time of the gentleman from Washington be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Washington. There are a great many matters that I should like to present, but I will not take the time to do it. I want to say that there are estimates for two projects. One is by the local engineer, costing a little over \$1,111,000. That is the one that my amendment covers. There is another project, recommended by his superior officer, which will cost a little over \$1,800,000.

Now, the amount estimated for by the local engineer is the amount provided for in the amendment. We believe that this House ought to make a provision for this. It ought to be constructed. This commerce is rapidly increasing, not only to the Orient, but to the regions of the north, to the gold-bearing sands of Nome and of the Yukon and all that great country. We believe that for the protection of the sailors who sail these ships, who run these steamers that carry these products, we ought to have this harbor of refuge, into which they can go when the storms rage, or when their ships are disabled and they are threatened with death.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, just a word on that. In the first place, it is open to a point of order, because it is a harbor and should have been offered earlier in the bill. I want to say for the gentleman that I really regard it as a very worthy project, probably the most deserving out on the northern Pacific coast; but it is altogether out of the question to undertake an enterprise of that amount of expense at present in addition to the one already included in the bill for the Columbia River, which is an improvement for many years under way, pressed upon us very strenuously, and where there seems necessity for immediate action. I trust the House will vote it down without hesitancy.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CAPRON). Did the Chair understand the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to make the point of order against this amendment?

Mr. BURTON. The point of order is that it occurs in the wrong place. Harbors come first, and then rivers. This is a harbor, not a river.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair finds upon examination that the point is well taken, so far as it applies to the pending section. It is not germane to the section of the bill now under discussion.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Chairman, it certainly is germane to the section of the bill, because the section covers both rivers and harbors. The order in which it comes, it seems to me, ought not to cut any figure, the mere matter of arrangement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hardly thought that the gentleman from Ohio would be likely to insist upon the point of order.

Mr. BURTON. This is the fact, Mr. Chairman: The section is a very long one. We have already been reading 81 pages of one section. I am inclined to waive the point of order and let this be voted on.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, before passing to section 2, unanimous consent has been asked to return to the Patuxent River, the provision for which is found on page 44 of the bill, and which is as follows:

Improving Patuxent River, Maryland, in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 170, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, \$6,000, to be expended upon the lesser project.

Some objections have been made to the appropriation of \$6,000, and I am inclined to think that it does come pretty near the margin. If the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MUDD] is here, I will

yield to him to make a statement. I want to say before he presents his statement, however, that it is a large river and has some localities bordering upon it where railway facilities are limited. I should like to hear a little more about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the provision referred to by the gentleman, on page 44, will be returned to and the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MUDD].

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Chairman, in the absence of any motion I scarcely see any necessity of a statement from me, unless it be desired by the chairman of the committee. I find that the clause in question was passed over at the request of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BELL], who does not seem now to be in his seat. I find from his statement that it would appear that the chief objection to this provision comes from a railroad, built, as the gentleman from Colorado said, by some friends of his who have spent about a million and a half dollars in building the railroad.

Now, I had not supposed that the wisdom or propriety of the propositions in this bill would be gauged by their desirability from the standpoint of competing railroads. The gentleman states that he is informed that \$1,000 would pay for all the freight that is carried over that river from the point named. As a matter of fact, I do not know anything about the freight charges or the income of the steamboat company from that source. I have not had an opportunity since the objection was made to investigate that, but I find from the report of the engineer of the War Department that about \$150,000 of commerce, including commerce to and from that point, is carried on that river each year.

The amount of money asked for is only \$6,000. This landing, in front of which there has formed a shoal in the last few years, is the only point from which the farmers of a large section can carry their produce to market, which is Baltimore city. I do not think any further statement is necessary. For my district I have only asked in this whole bill \$11,000, about one-fifteenth of the average appropriations for the districts in this country. It may be that some gentlemen may be surprised that I ask so little [laughter], and therefore think it should go out. The provision is reported by the committee, acting unanimously, so far as I know, and I believe it involves as much of merit and modesty combined as any provision in this whole bill.

Mr. BURTON. If no motion is made to strike it out it will remain in the bill, and no further proceeding is necessary. Objection was made by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BELL], not, I think, that he had any personal interest in it whatever, but that some acquaintances wrote him a note, and he brought it to the attention of the committee. I want to say that the traffic does not show as very great, but we regarded it as sufficient to justify this appropriation. If it should not increase in the next year or two, I question whether Congress ought to appropriate for it in the next bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That there shall be organized in the Office of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, by detail from time to time from the Corps of Engineers, a board of 5 engineer officers, whose duties shall be fixed by the Chief of Engineers, and to whom shall be referred for consideration and recommendation, in addition to any other duties assigned, so far as in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers may be necessary, all reports upon examinations and surveys provided for by Congress, and all projects or changes in projects for works of river and harbor improvement heretofore or hereafter provided for. And the board shall submit to the Chief of Engineers recommendations upon the desirability of commencing or continuing any and all improvements upon which reports are required. And in the consideration of such works and projects the board shall have in view the amount and character of commerce existing or reasonably prospective which will be benefited by the improvement, and the relation of the ultimate cost of such work, both as to cost of construction and maintenance, to the public commercial interests involved, and the public necessity for the work and propriety of its construction, continuance, or maintenance at the expense of the United States. And such consideration shall be given as time permits to such works as have heretofore been provided for by Congress, the same as in the case of new works proposed. The board shall, when it considers the same necessary, and with the sanction and under orders from the Chief of Engineers, make, as a board or through its members, personal examinations of localities. And all facts and information and arguments which are presented to the board for its consideration in connection with any matter referred to it by the Chief of Engineers shall be reduced to and submitted in writing, and made a part of the records of the Office of the Chief of Engineers. It shall further be the duty of said board, upon a request transmitted to the Chief of Engineers by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, or the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, in the same manner to examine and report through the Chief of Engineers upon any projects heretofore adopted by the Government or upon which appropriations have been made, and report upon the desirability of continuing the same or upon any modifications thereof which may be deemed desirable.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I reserve the point of order on that paragraph, and I should like to ask the gentleman from Ohio if that is not new legislation?

Mr. BURTON. Yes; but we have absolute authority to put that here in our bill. We have done that every year in some form or other.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does not this provide for a new commission?

Mr. BURTON. It provides for a new commission in one sense; not, however, imposing an additional expense on the Government directly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But it creates a new office.

Mr. BURTON. It does in this sense. It assigns officers of the engineers to duties not performed before, but does not create a new office.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It creates a new office for the engineer officers to occupy, or assigns them new duties, which is the same.

Mr. BURTON. You can hardly say that with correctness, for all now have to pass upon the advisability of projects. Now, that question of advisability is vested in a central board of five, rather than to all those engineers scattered over all the country. I regard it as a measure absolutely essential to the proper conduct of the service.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I reserved the point of order. I do not know whether I will make it—

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That it is new legislation in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that that point will not lie to a river and harbor bill. There is a distinction made between a general appropriation bill and the river and harbor bill. Under the rules any new legislation is obnoxious to the point of order raised by the gentleman; but that does not apply to a river and harbor appropriation bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is not germane to the legislation, Mr. Chairman; but reserve the point for the present. I wish to ask the gentleman a question. I do not know that I care to raise the point, but I think it is an important matter. In other words, as I understand this legislation, heretofore when a member of Congress desired to have an appropriation made for his district he had the right to go before the River and Harbor Committee, composed of his colleagues, and present his claim, ask for a hearing and ask for his appropriation. Now, I want to know how far this proposed legislation takes that right away from this House?

Mr. BURTON. Oh, not at all. Really the same right would exist. The River and Harbor Committee can include in their bill any project for which there is an estimate, whether there is a recommendation or not. It would tend, though, to bring a larger amount of information before that committee. It would tend especially—and that is the real object of this section—to establish some uniform standard for making recommendations. As I said in my introductory remarks, sometimes one engineer will take up a project that will cost \$200,000 and he will recommend it in glowing terms. Another, of more conservative mental type, would take another project, where one-fourth or one-fifth of the expenditure—say forty or fifty thousand dollars—would be clearly of greater benefit to the commerce of the country, but he will make a report against it—an adverse recommendation.

Now, that has continued so long that there was absolute confusion in the reports. Persons familiar with the work of the River and Harbor Committee for several years have come to have a certain judgment of the value of the reports of the respective engineers. Colonel so and so, they feel assured, will make a conservative report; lieutenant-colonel so and so, will report strongly in favor of a project; but we ought not to be asked to detect the different standards upon which they judge. It seems to us if he is sitting here in touch with his colleagues, and also in touch with all the improvements of the country, and not with detached projects, it would result in a very great advantage.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Is it proposed in this amendment to follow their judgment—

Mr. BURTON. Oh, it is not proposed to follow their judgment absolutely.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will it be necessary for a member of Congress desiring an appropriation to go to that board?

Mr. BURTON. No.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The judgment of the board will only be a guide to the committee?

Mr. BURTON. I will give the gentleman a statement which will make it more clear, perhaps. In the Treasury Department the Light-House Board makes reports as to aids to navigation, classifying them as "desirable," "necessary," and "indispensable." We did not think it best to go that far in regard to these recommendations, but we do hope for more uniformity and ampler information.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The idea is to have a general central board which shall pass on these matters as a guide for the committee?

Mr. BURTON. As a guide, and not controlling it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire at this point to submit an interrogatory to the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I find on page 83, line 9, this language:

The board shall, when it considers the same necessary, and with the sanction and under orders from the Chief of Engineers, make, as a board or through its members, personal examination of localities.

As I understand the law now, no member of this House can procure an examination by the Chief of Engineers of any project in

any locality without first getting a joint resolution through the House authorizing that examination to be made. Am I correct?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Now, this bill proceeds, among other things, to provide that a member of the House instead of presenting the matter first to the House and getting a joint resolution through providing for an examination can go to this board. Is that correct?

Mr. BURTON. No; it does not make any such change as that. The gentleman should read the whole section. It means that the board is to perform two classes of duty in the way of making an examination. One is, they shall review reports sent to them from the local engineers. These examinations will not be made by the local engineers without the direction of Congress embodied in a joint resolution or other form. It will not be possible under this act for a member to go before this board and ask them to make a preliminary examination for this or that locality.

But there is another class of examinations upon the board, namely, to review those already on the list, either at the request of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House or the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, or, I take it, on the initiative of the Chief of Engineers. I want to say that the committee are of the decided opinion that we have some projects on the list that will bear review, and we think they should be examined by the board. This provision has in view the personal examination by the whole board, if they find the question presented to them conflicting in its nature, or they may send one member of their board or send an inspector; but it does not change the law in regard to the modus operandi of starting a preliminary examination and survey. It will be noticed that this board is appointed by and acts for the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. CUSHMAN. That will require a joint resolution?

Mr. BURTON. A resolution, a bill, or something of that kind.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to submit the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all of section 3 in this bill.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment more for the purpose of hearing from the chairman of this committee than as evidencing any especial hostility to this provision of this bill. I have read section 3 of the bill several times, and I am unable to understand that this section contains any meritorious features over the system which is now in vogue. For instance, at the present time it is necessary to procure the passage of a joint resolution in order to have a preliminary survey made.

Now, all the local engineers at the present time are under one chief, and he has his various assistants located in different parts of the United States where improvements may be in process of completion or may be contemplated. Now, then, I can not see any advantage to be gained in subdividing the responsibility by the creation of a new board of five members, whose duties, as I understand the section, will be practically the same as that of the local engineers now located in the different parts of the United States. For instance, the engineer located on the Pacific coast makes a recommendation of a certain project, and that is submitted to the Chief Engineer for his action. If this board is created by this act, the board will simply do the same act that is now performed by the local engineer, for he would make the report and submit it to the Chief of Engineers, and the Chief of Engineers would finally pass judgment on that. In other words, I am unable to see wherein we would gain any advantage by the creation of a new board, merely to make additional reports that have no binding force. In fact, it seems to me it would tend to add to the confusion which is now complained of.

At the present time the Chief of Engineers must finally pass on all the reports of the local engineer, and, from the language of this section, it appears that the Chief of Engineers would still be called upon to pass upon the recommendation of the board if it shall be created. I am utterly unable to see from reading the section wherein we would gain any advantage, except by creating a new board and dividing the responsibility. I would like to hear from the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BURTON. I have gone into that subject quite fully. The same inquiry might be made in reference to the judges scattered all over the United States.

Why not make the decision of a judge in southern California for instance final; why not do away with the circuit court of appeals and the Supreme Court? I might ask, why not take into account the further fact that one officer will decide one way and another another; that one in southern California or Oregon or Washington will have one standard and another in Massachusetts or Maine or Georgia will have an entirely different standard? In practice this is the very worst defect of the system. One engineer will proceed as if he were a member of the community—identified with it, as he should be to a certain extent—having all the partialities of a resident in that part of the country, and who thus may be as much

interested in the improvement of the harbor as would be a large owner of real estate in that locality.

Another officer will stand up straight and say, "I represent the Government of the United States. I am not going to allow any extravagant improvements, or any improvement which does not conform to a very conservative standard; to go through with my recommendation." Thus there come up from all these engineers all over the country a variety of reports, so that absolute chaos is created by a lack of uniformity among them. The most casual reader can see that A, B, C, D, and E, down to the end of the alphabet, are acting in accordance with different standards. In a measure the committee can correct this, but only partially, because we can inspect only a few of these localities, and even with the most carefully prepared reports before us we can not tell which should be followed and which should not.

Now, this appellate court (for that is what it is), this general court, will be in touch, not with one particular locality, but with all localities. It will recognize that not all these projects can be adopted, that some must no doubt be excluded. It can tell what report will be helpful to the committee, what report will tend to exclude that class of projects whose exclusion will make it possible to pass a judicious river and harbor bill and keep our appropriations within reason.

I now yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN] for a question.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I merely desired to say that, as I understand this proposition, the hypothetical case as stated by the chairman in making his comparison between the various judges of the United States and the board to be created by this bill is not a proper comparison, for the decision of a judge is to a certain extent final, while the decision of this board sought to be created would not in any sense be final or in any sense binding on the River and Harbor Committee. For instance, when the local engineer makes his report, that is not final; when this board, if it should be created, makes its decision and report, that would not be final; when the Chief of Engineers reviews the report of the board and makes his report, that would not be final. The River and Harbor Committee would then adopt or reject any or all of these recommendations, just as it does now.

In other words, the creation of this new board, as I understand, will not make any of the reports final, but will simply create an additional channel through which all these various projects must go, and that, I contend, will be apt to create confusion and not to produce harmony. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] objects to the present condition of affairs because there is lack of harmony in the reports which are now made. This he proposes to remedy by appointing more officials to make more reports.

Mr. BURTON. I really do not see the interrogation in the gentleman's interruption [laughter]; but the action of the Engineer Department should be as nearly as possible similar to the action of a court. I now yield to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING] for a question.

Mr. KING. The gentleman from Washington has anticipated in the interrogatory which he submitted to the chairman what I was going to say. After all, it finally rests with the committee to determine what appropriations shall be made.

Mr. BURTON. But the committee desires to have before it the best possible information. It does not wish to omit any possible means of obtaining information which is accurate and well prepared. It desires recommendations based upon the facts brought before the engineers, which shall guide it in deciding upon works for improvement and enable it to decide judiciously. No doubt we go very largely on the report of the engineers. The trouble is now that upon estimates of \$300,000,000 we have to select projects costing less than \$60,000,000.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. CUSHMAN, it was rejected.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I understand from members here that a motion which I made the other day—

Mr. KING. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. The whole of this section, section 3, has not been read, I understand.

The CHAIRMAN. It has not.

Mr. KING. And a point of order would be permissible at the conclusion of the reading?

The CHAIRMAN. It would be. The Clerk will continue the reading.

Mr. BELL. Wait a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BELL. I have a purpose which I will state if the Chair will allow me. When page 44 of the bill was reached the other day I rose to make a motion to strike out the paragraph. The chairman of the committee asked me whether I would not pass that matter over and call it up later.

Mr. BURTON. No; the gentleman, I think, is in error in regard to the statement made by me. I myself asked unanimous consent that that be passed over until the end of the section was reached. Promptly when the close of the section was reached

and its consideration concluded I asked to have the matter brought up again.

Mr. BELL. You asked to have it put off on my motion, and when I was opposing it; and yet you bring it up in my absence. The matter was taken up when I was temporarily absent from the Hall and was concluded, although on my own suggestion it was passed over.

Mr. BURTON. Of course the gentleman will recognize the fact that it would be impossible, in the very nature of things, for the chairman of a committee having a bill of this kind in charge to take cognizance not only of all matters connected with the conduct of the bill upon the floor, but to make himself aware of the movements of gentlemen, as to whether they are absent or present upon the floor during the discussion or consideration.

Mr. BELL. I have been here every minute during the consideration of this bill, excepting for a single moment or two when I was absent for a hasty lunch.

Mr. BURTON. I do not see that the chairman of the committee is responsible, of course, for the absence of the gentleman.

Mr. BELL. But I understood you to make a positive agreement that this should go over until the end of the reading, as an accommodation to me, because of information that I had which I desired to lay before the committee.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman, of course, is kind to himself in his statement.

Mr. BELL. I am only stating what actually took place.

Mr. BURTON. I believe I have the floor now.

Mr. BELL. No; I have the floor.

Mr. BURTON. I was only going to say to the gentleman that I shall not object to going back, if it be the wish of the committee, and take up this matter again. I think, however, that we ought to finish it promptly and have done with it. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MUDD] I see is present—

Mr. BELL. I think you should have waited, before disposing of the matter, until I came in—

Mr. BURTON. Oh, well, I have stated to the gentleman that I can not stand responsible for his absences.

Mr. BELL (continuing). Especially as the matter went over on my objection.

Mr. BURTON. If I am in error as to the exact form in which the consent was obtained, I am willing that the gentleman may correct me. My recollection is that the matter was postponed, and distinctly understood to be postponed, until the conclusion of the reading of the first section. Now, when the matter had been concluded as far as the reading was concerned, it certainly was not the duty of the chairman of the committee to investigate and find whether the gentleman was present in his seat or not. The matter was called up and disposed of in its regular order. But as I have said, I do not object to recurring to it again, if it be so desired.

Mr. BELL. In the first place, this matter was passed over on my objection. In the second place, it was passed over with the understanding that we would recur to it at a certain time. It was passed at the request of the gentleman from Ohio that I might call it up in the future. In my absence, the gentleman called it up himself. Now, I am prepared to give him some information on the subject, and I am prepared to show that it is an absolute absurdity to make this appropriation; that the conditions have entirely changed since the report of the engineer was made; and I say that it is unfair for the chairman to allow those interested in promoting this project to take advantage of the few minutes that I was absent and bring it up. I do not think that I had reason to expect such treatment on the part of the chairman—

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to call the gentleman to order. I do not object, as I have said, to a simple motion to recur to the matter, or unanimous consent to recur to it, but I do object to criticisms which I regard as unfounded and unwarranted. Now, if the gentleman wants to recur to the section I have no possible objection, but if, instead of making a request to do that in an orderly and parliamentary manner, he chooses to go on and allege unfairness on the part of the chairman of the committee—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that this discussion is only proceeding by unanimous consent, and is entirely out of order. If there is no motion made, the Chair will direct the Clerk to proceed with the reading.

Mr. BELL. Well, while I know that gentlemen have heard this matter in my absence, although I had made the objection to it, I ask unanimous consent to recur to the passage on page 44 of the bill, beginning with line 15.

Mr. BURTON. I will not object to recurring to the passage, although I do not think the statement of the gentleman entitles him to that indulgence.

Mr. BELL. Well, the gentleman from Colorado thinks it does.

Mr. MUDD. If I may be allowed a single moment, I apprehend that this matter was held over the other day partly out of courtesy

to myself, I being a member from the district in which this river lies—

The CHAIRMAN. This is all out of order. The Chair will submit the question.

Mr. MUDD (continuing). And I am somewhat surprised at criticisms of this character coming from members 2,000 miles away.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will submit the request for unanimous consent. Is there objection to recurring to the paragraph referred to by the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Improving Patuxent River, Maryland, in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 170, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, \$6,000, to be expended upon the lesser project.

Mr. BELL. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want a little time to state the condition of this.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is out of order.

Mr. BELL. How is that?

The CHAIRMAN. There is no motion pending before the committee.

Mr. BELL. The motion I made the other day, as I understood it, was to strike out this paragraph, and it was passed over. That is the motion I rose to make.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that that was not formally made.

Mr. BELL. I make the motion now. I rose to make it, and we passed it at the request of the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the gentleman's motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all of lines 15 to 18, inclusive, on page 44.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, in the first place the commerce of this river, at the point where the dredging is to be, was practically nothing in the beginning. The men running the steamboat claim that there was about \$75,000 worth of stuff moved out and in annually. Now, that was at a time when they had no other transportation whatever. Subsequently this Chesapeake Beach Railroad was built in over the same line, crossing the stream one-eighth of a mile below this point. As I understand, this railroad took what little commerce they did have on the river, and since the changed condition there is practically none. I overheard a conversation here the other morning of a gentleman from Detroit with one of the officers of the company, and asked the officer of the company to write me about the facts in the case. He wrote me here saying that the commerce at that point is not a thousand dollars a year at this time.

Mr. MUDD. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. BELL. Yes.

Mr. MUDD. I should like to ask who wrote this letter?

Mr. BELL. It was written by the president of this railroad company. I am going to make a complete admission. The railroad company is opposed to this; but that is no reason why a bad scheme should go through, that a railroad company is opposed to it. The only opposition of the railroad company is that it would require them to keep a drawbridge there in order to allow the boats to go an eighth of a mile.

The report of the Government engineer shows that it is a ridiculous proposition. It shows, in the first place, that in 1899, when this was arranged for, the commerce going out of there was only about \$75,000 a year and that coming in was about \$75,000 a year. Here it is, and I will be glad to give the information to anybody. Since that time this railroad has come in there and has taken what little they had. Now, I say, if this road had not gone in there they ought to have this, probably; but the road going in has naturally taken what little commerce they had. The people are accommodated, anyway, and it seems to me ridiculous that they should dredge this channel. They dredged it in 1899. It has filled up since, and these railroad men say they never can keep it dredged. It is only claimed that the steamboat goes in there once a week now.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BELL. Yes.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Is this a navigable stream?

Mr. BELL. Yes; and the point that they want to dredge is at the upper end, where it is claimed they have no commerce of any consequence.

Mr. DAVIDSON. What right has the railroad company to put a stationary bridge there?

Mr. BELL. It has no right at all. I say the railroad is not entitled to any consideration, and the mere fact that the railroad is opposed to it or that it will injure the railroad is not important; but the fact that that railroad has come in here and taken what little traffic there was, and accommodates those people, makes it a foolish expenditure. If they had not the railroad there I would say "Give them what they ask," but as they have got a railroad

it seems to me to be unnecessary. I have the report of the engineer upon which the original recommendation was made.

The engineer refers to the statement of the president of the Weems Steamboat Company, of Baltimore, who says:

The number of passengers a year to and from Bristol is about 1,200. The business done at that point is quite large; for 5 or 6 miles around the people have all of their supplies landed at this place and ship all of their crops, etc., from here. The business is mostly done from Baltimore, and I suppose that the value of the goods landed there, which consists of groceries, dry goods, and other articles usually consumed through the country, is fully \$75,000. The shipments consist of tobacco, corn, wheat, poultry, eggs, fruit, and other commodities produced in this section of the country. I estimate the value of them at \$75,000 at least.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. BELL. I ask unanimous consent that the letter which I gave to the chairman of the committee may be read. I have no interest in this. I gave the chairman all the information I had.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BELL. I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended to allow that letter to be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 9, 1901.

MY DEAR JUDGE: Referring to my conversation with you this morning at the Capitol, during which I promised to write you the facts in connection with the paragraph in the river and harbor bill which is objectionable to me, I now desire to state that this paragraph covers an appropriation of \$5,000 for deepening the channel of Patuxent River to Pig Point Landing, one-eighth of a mile above the bridge on which our railroad crosses the river.

The object of this appropriation was simply to afford access by the Weems Line steamer to this landing. For your information I will state that the steamer only lands at this point once a week, and the entire gross amount carried in and out by same will not exceed \$1,000 for the entire year.

Little was accomplished in the way of making this part of Patuxent River accessible the first time such an appropriation was made, and the same amount will have to be expended every year or so to give a very small amount of traffic an outlet by water, as the river here is little more than a mud hole and fills in very rapidly.

However, since the first appropriation was made, in order to give the people in the neighborhood of Pig Point a connection with Baltimore, etc., we have expended one and a half million dollars in completing a railroad from Washington, D. C., to Chesapeake Beach, Md., with a direct connection with Baltimore through the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. Our line of road crosses Patuxent River just one-eighth of a mile below Pig Point. We have a regular station at this place, and are prepared to accept both the freight and passenger business at rates as low as those in effect by the steamer, and can give a quicker and more satisfactory inlet and outlet to all traffic which would otherwise go to Pig Point Landing by boat.

We do not object to steamboat competition, but we do object to having to keep a man in charge of drawbridge and keep draw in operation at a very great expense in order to afford access to this point, just one-eighth of a mile away, by steamer once a week.

This appropriation is a waste of money to the Government and is unnecessary as a means of serving the people, as the traffic is naturally falling into our hands owing to the facilities we are able to offer by a daily connection with Washington and Baltimore. The appropriation is also unfair to us in that we are forced to expend this large amount of money in keeping draw in order and a man in charge.

Trusting that you may be able to have the limit of the appropriation extend to our bridge only and not above, or cut out entirely,

I am, yours, very respectfully,

OTTO MEARS, President.

HON. JOHN C. BELL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be recognized in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

In the first place, I desire to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the gentleman has not fairly and accurately stated to the committee the contents of the report from which he undertook to read, as to the commerce of this place, which forms the subject-matter of the present controversy.

The information which I have before me, and which the gentleman had before him, came, it is true, from the president of the steamboat company, but it is adopted by the Engineer Department of the Government as being reliable, as I submit that it is, and it states the incoming commerce of that point to be \$75,000 and the outgoing to be \$75,000, which, I take it, it will be conceded even by the gentleman from Colorado, amounts when taken together to \$150,000, which is a very different showing as to the commerce of this river at this landing of Bristol than that which is represented by the gentleman.

Mr. BELL. That is what I stated.

Mr. MUDD. Now, Mr. Chairman, I admit that that is not a very great amount of commerce. I admit that this is not a very wealthy section of country, but there are a great many people in this locality who are dependent upon this place for shipment to the only market which they have, which is Baltimore city, of all the crops they produce, and all the things they have to sell to gain their livelihood.

The gentleman has made a statement that the railroad company, since its construction across that river, has taken away nearly all of the business that had formerly been given to the steamer.

This is entirely erroneous. The market for these people is Baltimore City. None of their produce comes to Washington; they do not want it to come to Washington, and it does not suit them to send it here, and the railroad furnishes no adequate or practical method of transportation to Baltimore city.

Now, the gentleman somewhat surprises me, as I am sure he does the House, when he comes here and asks this committee to refuse an appropriation unanimously recommended by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors for the small sum of \$6,000 to promote and to continue navigation, to supply the needs of a large rural section, because a railroad corporation asks him to save to it the expense of hiring a man to keep the drawbridge on the river. It is refreshing, indeed, to find this gentleman here, thousands of miles away from his own home, where he appears in a very different light, posing as the apologist and defender of railroad companies as against the interests of the people.

Mr. SHATTUC. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. MUDD. Yes, if it does not take too much of my time.

Mr. SHATTUC. May I ask the gentleman if the gentleman who wrote him is not his constituent?

Mr. MUDD. I understand that the gentleman says that the money comes from his State.

Mr. SHATTUC. Do you not represent your constituents?

Mr. MUDD. I try to do so, and have been hoping that I was doing it fairly well.

Mr. SHATTUC. That is what this gentleman is doing.

Mr. MUDD. I think I can represent the gentleman's constituents about as well as he can mine, and my own constituents somewhat better than he can.

I understand the gentleman frankly states that the money to build this railroad comes from his State. Evidently the gentleman here in Washington, a great distance away from his own bailiwick, against the interests of these people down in Calvert and Anne Arundel counties, in Maryland, is willing to set up the claim of a few dollars of expense to the railroad company. It is evident that the gentleman here in Washington City is even willing to give some tolerance to the doctrine that we have heard berated in another form and in another field of discussion, with which he is familiar, of "putting the dollar before the man."

If it is true that the railroad company is dividing the traffic of this section—and no one can pretend it is doing more than that—then it may be fairly conceded that it is producing competition, which the people of that section ought to profit by. I do not apprehend that the gentleman from Colorado will want to stand up here and place himself in the category of opposing competition and of being the especial representative and champion of monopolies and trusts. I do not think, at least, that he wants to bear that reputation at home, whatever he may be willing to do as to my district here in the State of Maryland, several thousand miles away from his home.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the president of this railroad company is my friend, as much so, perhaps, as he is that of the gentleman from Colorado, and I am anxious to help him in any way that I can. The president of the steamboat company, on the other hand, is not my friend, certainly not in a political sense, and not in any particular manner in any other sense that I am aware of; but I submit to the gentleman from Colorado that the mere matter of a friendship between two men is not exactly a fair standard of conduct or a justifiable motive to guide us in acting upon matters affecting the public interests here in Congress. At least, I am not willing to be guided by any such considerations.

Now, the facts in this case, so far as I know them, are simply these: Quite a number of people—people of moderate means mostly—living over a considerable extent of territory, want this appropriation—a modest and meritorious appropriation—to enable them to carry on with facility the traffic which means so much to them, with the chief commercial city of our State; and I take it that the fair-minded members of this body will not allow the question of a drawbridge of a competing railroad to stand in the way of their receiving their just dues in the matter of such provisions as it is the purpose of this bill to make.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. BELL. Division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 9, noes 88.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

The board shall have authority, with the approval of the Chief of Engineers, to rent quarters, if necessary, for the proper transaction of its business, and to employ such civil employees as may, in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers, be required for properly transacting the business assigned to it, and the necessary expenses of the board shall be paid from allotments made by the Chief of Engineers from any appropriations made by Congress for the work or works to which the duties of the board pertain.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against section 3, upon the ground that it contains legislation which is not germane to the bill, and such provisions as do not come properly within the province of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. By reference to the rules of the House—Rule XI—I find that the powers and duties of this committee relate to the improvement of rivers and harbors.

I also find in the same rule that a committee of this House is created, known as the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River. This proposed legislation, Mr. Chairman, goes further than a mere provision for the improvement of rivers and harbors, and certainly is objectionable, because it infringes upon the duties, powers, and privileges of the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River. With this legislation embodied—

Mr. BURTON. I hope the gentleman will permit me to interrupt him. How does it infringe on the powers and privileges of the Committee on the Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River? How is it to confer additional powers on the War Department or give to this committee powers that belong to the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River? In what section or what paragraph?

Mr. KING. The gentleman does not apprehend the point which I am attempting to make; perhaps it is owing to my inability to state it clearly. The point I attempted to make is this: That section 3 is not germane to the bill and trenches upon the prerogatives of another committee. If the legislation which is proposed shall be enacted, it will infringe upon the powers and duties of the Committee on the Levees of the Mississippi River. This section proposes to create a new board, which would possess such duties and authority as to deprive the Committee on Levees of powers which it now exercises.

The Committee on Levees of the Mississippi River does not have a board of supervision and revision over it and which submits reports with reference to rivers and harbors in the country for its guidance. Here is a board to be constituted which will supervise the reports made with reference to the Mississippi River, and to that extent, it seems to me, it would be infringing on the powers of that committee. That committee would then, if this board is established, be more or less limited by that body.

This is an attempt to create a new board in an appropriation bill instead of legislating with reference to rivers and harbors. Of course no one denies the power of Congress to so legislate as to wipe out a committee. An independent bill could deal with this question, and no objection could be made that it created a board which destroyed the powers of any House committee. But here is a committee, charged with a special duty, which seeks to create a board to supervise another committee.

Passing the question raised by the point of order, I desire to frankly confess that there is merit in the proposed measure. My principal reason in suggesting the point of order is for the purpose of inviting the attention of members to the unwise system prevailing in reference to the control of rivers and harbors. I am not opposed to reasonable expenditures in behalf of rivers and harbors clearly national and necessary for Federal commerce as distinguished from local commerce.

But I am opposed to the manner in which appropriations such as those contained in this bill are made. There is a growing disposition upon the part of the public to regard the National Government as a fit subject for exploitation and the Federal Treasury as the common property of all. Accordingly, the people are insistent upon governmental aid for purely private and local concerns.

They often demand that their Representatives in Congress shall secure appropriations for these local and special interests, and "statesmanship" of members is by these same people measured by their success in exploiting the Government for projects and measures against which the Constitution stands as a bulwark.

Is it to be wondered at, under these conditions, that river and harbor bills are so "fearfully and wonderfully made?" It is not to be doubted that each Congressional district has a creek or river or inlet or harbor. It is easy to believe that competition in the matter of transportation will cheapen traffic rates, and it is not difficult to show that an appropriation by the Government will make a stream larger and a harbor deeper, thus encouraging water transportation and so developing commerce. And so we have the engineers reporting that \$300,000,000 could be profitably spent now for the improvement of rivers and harbors.

Mr. Chairman, the system is wrong. Members should not be called upon to spend their time endeavoring to secure an appropriation for some creek in their districts.

If this Government is to appropriate for rivers and harbors in the aid of interstate commerce, then there should be some broad and comprehensive system adopted.

The unwisdom of the present policy is apparent in the pending measure. Competent engineers of the Army recommend \$300,000,000. The committee can not report a measure embracing so

large an amount. So the engineers' estimates and reports are ignored, and reductions are made here and changes there until the bill is reduced to \$60,000,000.

This system, it is thought by some, results in "logrolling" and combinations between sections and members. And sometimes charges are made that particular sections or persons are favored. In the discussion of this very bill a distinguished member charged that most of the \$60,000,000 carried by the bill goes to the States represented by the members of the committee. Unfairness is sometimes charged under this policy, and crimination and recrimination indulged in. The effect is demoralizing. The whole question should be placed upon a higher plane.

Mr. Chairman, I confess that I have no superior knowledge upon this subject, but it has occurred to me that it would be far better if a board of eminent engineers were created, to whom this entire matter could be intrusted.

Surround the board with reasonable limitations, and empower them to determine when and how the money appropriated by Congress for the improvement of harbors and great waterways of commerce should be expended.

This board would not be responsible to local constituencies. They would see the national requirements and devise an harmonious and systematic governmental plan of development.

Mr. BURTON. I think it is hardly necessary for me, Mr. Chairman, to answer at any length the remarks made on the point of order. The gentleman from Utah is grieved at heart about the criminations and recriminations uttered upon this bill, and thinks that if something else had been done these utterances might have been saved. I want to say to the gentleman that he will find that the amount of crimination and recrimination will be greatest in proportion as the bill is a good one, and as schemes and projects which are unworthy have been excluded from it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. If the gentleman from Ohio will pardon me, I want to say that members need not be anxious about the debate on this bill. If they will go back eight or twelve years ago and read the debates in Congress, they will discover that the debates on this bill have been in the nature of a zephyr as compared with the cyclone which used to sweep over the House when this bill was before it. [Laughter.]

Mr. BURTON. Now, Mr. Chairman, this is not a general appropriation bill, and it is not an appropriation bill proper. This river and harbor bill for the last twelve years has included appropriations for the modification of bridges, for the disposal of wrecks in navigable waters, providing penalties for putting obstructions in canals, and providing penalties for the discharge of refuse into navigable channels; and a great variety of criminal and civil jurisprudence pertaining to rivers and harbors has grown up from the river and harbor bill. In the general statutes of the United States can be found numerous sections derived from these successive acts. We have also included in every bill regulations for the proper management of river and harbor improvement, for the making of surveys, and these regulations have been changed from time to time. I can not say that this point has never been raised before, but certainly it never has been raised successfully, for the uniform decisions have been that this class of provisions is germane to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the rule with reference to appropriations that there shall be no new legislation does not apply to the river and harbor bill, and has been so decided again and again by gentlemen who have presided at the time the bill was considered in Committee of the Whole. The Chair thinks, also, that the section against which the point of order has been made does not infringe upon any of the rights of the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River. At the time of the revision of the rules, in 1880, it was sought to give this committee on the levees the authority that is now claimed by it by the gentleman from Utah, but by an express vote of the House the authority was denied the committee, and, inferentially, was given to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. The Chair thinks the provision against which the point of order has been made is in harmony with the general objects and purposes of the bill, that it is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and, therefore, overrules the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That the President of the United States is authorized, by diplomatic negotiations or otherwise, to enter into such agreements as will secure as far as possible the maintenance of suitable levels in the Great Lakes and connecting waters between the United States and Canada.

Mr. BURTON. I move to amend by substituting for the section just read that which I send to the desk. The provision in the amendment is based upon one which has already passed the Senate and has received careful consideration from the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House. The Committee regards the provision which I now offer as an improvement on the briefer section which was first included in the bill. While the section as read may be sufficient, the substitute is more ample and comprehensive.

The amendment offered by Mr. BURTON was read, as follows:

Strike out section 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 4. That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to invite the Government of Great Britain to join in the formation of an international commission, to be composed of three members from each country, whose duty it shall be from time to time to report upon the conditions and uses of the waters adjacent to the boundary line between the United States and Canada, including all the waters of the lakes and rivers whose waters flow by the river St. Lawrence to the Atlantic Ocean; also upon the maintenance and regulation of suitable levels, and also upon the effect upon the shores of these waters and the structures thereon, and upon the interests of navigation by reason of their diversion from their natural flow; and further to report upon the necessary measures to regulate such diversions, and further to enter into such agreements and make such recommendations for improvements as shall best subserve the interests of navigation in said waters.

"The President is authorized to appoint the United States members of such commission, and said commission is authorized to employ such surveyors, experts, and other persons as it may deem needful in the performance of the duties hereby imposed.

"And for the purpose of said commission the Secretary of War is authorized to expend from the amounts heretofore appropriated for securing a 20-foot channel in the connecting waters of the Great Lakes between Buffalo and Duluth and Chicago the sum of \$20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary to pay the portion of the expenses of said commission chargeable to the United States, including compensation for said commissioners representing the United States, and of surveyors, experts, and other necessary services."

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, I regard the proposed substitute as the most valuable and beneficial provision for the commercial interests of our country of any in the bill. I hope it will be adopted.

[Mr. SCUDDER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The question being taken, the amendment of Mr. BURTON was adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. That when any property which has been heretofore, or may be hereafter, purchased or acquired for the improvement of rivers and harbors is no longer needed, or is no longer serviceable, it may be sold in such manner as the Secretary of War may direct and the proceeds credited to the appropriation for the work for which it was purchased or acquired; and the Secretary of War may direct the transfer of any property employed in river and harbor works, and in such event the property so transferred shall be valued and credited to the project upon which it was theretofore used and charged to the project to which it shall be transferred. The Secretary may also direct a temporary transfer of any property employed in the improvement of rivers and harbors whenever, in his judgment, such transfer would secure efficient or economical results, and such adjustment in the way of charges and credits shall be made between the projects affected as may be equitable.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the amendment which I send to the desk. I will say to the chairman of the committee that I doubt whether this amendment should go upon the pending section; but it seems to me it ought to go into the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add to section 5, line 5, on page 85, the following:

"That all persons hereafter employed by the United States or by any contractor or subcontractor, under and by virtue of the authority hereby granted and appropriations hereby made, shall be bona fide residents or citizens of the United States; and all contracts or subcontracts made for the expenditure of the moneys hereby appropriated shall expressly prohibit the employment of nonresident foreigners in the execution of said public improvements. A violation of said provision by any contractor or subcontractor shall render such contract or subcontract null and void."

Mr. BURTON. I rise to a point of order. In the first place, the amendment is not germane to this section; I query whether it is germane to the bill.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is a very important proposition. A very large proportion of the labor for which money is expended upon the lakes and rivers under contract is performed by alien laborers—persons who are known as "birds of passage," who come forward whenever a contract is made and take from American workmen the fruits of the labor which they should enjoy.

Mr. BURTON. If such a regulation as the gentleman proposes is proper, why does not the gentleman make it broad and general—applying to public buildings and all other classes of public works? Why seek to bring it in here on a river and harbor bill as an amendment?

Mr. CORLISS. I shall be very glad to answer that question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to hear the gentleman from Michigan on the question whether the proposed amendment is germane to the purpose of the bill.

Mr. CORLISS. If the Chair will permit me I desire to answer that question. In order to place myself correctly before the House on this question I wish to state that the reason I offer this proposition here is that while a bill has been for some years pending before Congress, looking to the position I now take, restricting the employment of labor or public works to citizens or residents of the United States and prohibiting the employment of nonresidents or aliens—"birds of passage"—this proposition is particularly in line with that suggestion, because it applies to work done upon the border, in waters that divide our country from a foreign country, where the injury to American labor by foreign competition is very much greater than in the interior sections of the country. This question was brought before Congress in 1874 and carefully considered.

Now, with reference to the legislation, I would be glad in my own time to have read a letter from the Immigration Commissioner, and also a letter from the United States immigration inspector of the Treasury Department, bearing directly upon this question. I ask to have these read in my own time.

Mr. BURTON. Oh, Mr. Chairman, we have already consumed so much time upon this bill—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that in the judgment of the Chair this is a separate and independent proposition, without reference to what may be its merits, and the Chair must hold that it is not germane to the purposes of the bill, and sustains the point of order.

Mr. CORLISS. I only desired, Mr. Chairman, to get into the RECORD, before the ruling of the Chair, the communication to which I have referred and which is a matter of considerable importance. I was in hopes the gentleman from Ohio would not object, but would allow this to go on record.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent to have the communication printed in the RECORD?

Mr. CORLISS. I do ask unanimous consent to have these letters printed in connection with my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CORLISS]?

There was no objection.

The letters referred to by Mr. CORLISS are as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER-GENERAL OF IMMIGRATION,
Washington, January 10, 1901.

SIR: I have the honor to inclose herewith a copy of a communication received from Charles C. Williams, immigrant inspector at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., which contains an apparently practicable suggestion in connection with the proposed improvement of St. Marys River.

Respectfully,

T. V. POWDERLY,
Commissioner-General.

Hon. JOHN B. CORLISS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
UNITED STATES IMMIGRATION SERVICE,
Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., January 7, 1901.

SIR: From newspaper reports I learn that several millions of dollars are about to be expended by the Government in improvements on St. Marys River. It would be a very desirable improvement if a clause could be inserted in Government contracts with operators and dredge men prohibiting them from employing aliens on this work, or at least obliging them to employ none but bona fide residents of the United States. Most of the wages paid out during the expenditure of the last appropriation went to "birds of passage."

There was some correspondence between the Bureau and the War Department on this subject some years ago, the date of which I am unable to give owing to the destruction of my records by fire in August, 1896.

Respectfully,

C. C. WILLIAMS,
Immigrant Inspector.

Hon. T. V. POWDERLY,
Commissioner-General of Immigration, Washington, D. C.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read section 7, as follows:

SEC. 7. That the provisions of river and harbor acts heretofore passed providing for the prosecution of work upon the following projects are hereby repealed, and any amounts heretofore appropriated for any of the same now remaining unexpended shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States, to wit:

Entrance to Point Judith Pond, Rhode Island;
Harbor of St. Augustine, Fla.;
Pensaukee Harbor, Wisconsin;
New River, Virginia and West Virginia;
Cypress Bayou, Texas and Louisiana;
Wolf Lake, Indiana;
Chippewa River, Wisconsin;
Yellowstone River, Montana and North Dakota;
Clearwater River, Idaho;
Boat railway from the foot of The Dalles Rapids to the head of Celilo Falls, Washington and Oregon.

Mr. OTEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out line 1, page 86. I refer to New River, Virginia and West Virginia.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the first time that I have ever desired to strike out New River [laughter], but I am as much in earnest and as serious about it now as a man who is going to be hung. [Laughter.] It is a matter of great importance that this amount should still be available for the purpose of the improvement of that river. It is an unexpended balance of but \$2,300, and the Treasury of the United States does not need it at all. The report of the engineer in charge of the work some years ago, which indicated that there was no need for using it, was made so long ago that conditions have materially changed, and the steamboat that is on that river now is necessary for the transportation of the traffic along its banks.

The improvement of this stream is just as important as the improvement of other rivers embodied in this bill. The chairman of the committee has not seen this river. Some people call it a little creek, but the longest iron bridge in the State of Virginia crosses this stream at Radford, and all that is necessary to make the river available for the commerce upon its banks is the utilization of this

\$2,300 to make the navigation possible for that steamboat up and down the stream.

I went to a distinguished member of the River and Harbor Committee—which some gentleman in the rear irreverently calls the "Robber" and Harbor Committee, but which enconium I do not pass upon the committee myself. I went to a distinguished member and he advised me to bring in an amendment, such as I brought in a short time ago, with a request that the River and Harbor Committee would concur in the amendment. But the generalship of the chairman of that committee is a monument to his management. When I expected an avalanche of votes from the other side of the House and a unanimous vote on this side, and when I tried to keep the chairman from doing anything opposed to the amendment, he got up and gave but a word or two, and what was the result? Why, Mr. Chairman, I was routed—horse, foot, and dragoons. [Laughter.]

Now, I do not ask any appropriation, but simply that you strike this out covering that amount back into the Treasury. Why? You can not use it. We can not use it there, unless you give the engineer in charge the power to use it. If the necessities of the case demand, it, then why not permit him to use it and let the work go on?

I therefore hope that the chairman of the committee will feel some sort of sympathy in this matter, exhibit some human kindness in his soul, and not have the heart to get up and oppose this as he has done heretofore, because this is a provision which stands upon an entirely different footing. This money has been appropriated. I only ask that you allow it to remain in the bill and strike out this proposition which covers it back into the Treasury.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I notice that this item is up now for the second time. We had a discussion upon the floor upon it, and it was defeated at that time.

I will only say that for many years past no work has been done on that river. The engineer reports that it is useless to do any work. The stream runs through a rocky gorge, and in order to improve it it will need expensive works, and very extensive rock excavations would have to be made.

It is \$2,300 and it has been left hanging now for ten years. Nobody knows what to do with it. Nobody has any idea of expending it on this river. Now, to say that we can not repeal this item and turn the money back into the Treasury is to say that whenever by Congressional appropriation any money has been lodged somewhere we are never to remove it from that lodgment, but that it must stay there always. It seems to me this House should have the courage, in so clear a case as this, after ten years in which not a dollar has been expended and where there is no probability of any money ever being expended, to pursue a businesslike course and take it off the books. If an appropriation is needed in the future for any practicable improvement, we can give it careful attention.

Mr. OTEY. Will the gentleman wait a moment before he sits down?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. OTEY. The gentleman speaks of rock which, he says, will have to be taken out. I guarantee that you will not have to take out any rock; you will not have to make one blast. The only thing is to clean out the channel that has already been made by the United States Government at an expense of over a hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. BURTON. Have you been having an earthquake there to get rid of some of those rocks?

Mr. OTEY. No; but we do not want any rock work done; we just want to clean out the channel that is there.

Mr. BURTON. That does not agree with the engineer's report about that.

Mr. OTEY. That engineer's report was made ten years ago, when you and I were boys. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. OTEY].

The question being taken, Mr. OTEY demanded a division, but subsequently, pending the announcement of the division, withdrew the demand.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 10. That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to cause preliminary examinations or surveys to be made at the localities named in this section as hereinafter provided. In all cases, except as herein especially directed, a preliminary examination shall first be made, which shall embrace information concerning the commercial importance, present and prospective, of the river or harbor mentioned, and a report as to the advisability of its improvement. Whenever such preliminary examination has been made, in case such improvement is not deemed advisable no further action shall be taken thereon without the direction of Congress; but in case the report has been or shall be to the effect that such river or harbor is worthy of improvement, the Secretary of War is hereby directed, at his discretion, to cause surveys to be made and the cost of improving such river or harbor to be estimated and to be reported to Congress, to wit:

Mr. BURTON. I ask to offer an amendment which I think is made necessary there by the insertion of section 3.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.
The Clerk read as follows:

In line 21, page 87, after the word "Congress," insert: "Provided, That in all cases preliminary examinations as well as surveys shall be examined or reviewed by the said board provided for in section 3, who shall make reports thereon."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

ARKANSAS.

Little Red River, from its mouth to and including Government quarries at Bee Rock, with a view to low-water navigation.

Mr. BURTON. I desire to offer an amendment to include a survey there.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 25, page 87, after the word "navigation," insert the following: "California: Humboldt Bay, at the northern and southern ends."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

DELAWARE.

Harbor at Wilmington, Delaware and Christiana rivers, with a view to providing bulkheads for said harbor and widening and maintaining a channel 21 feet deep.

Mr. HOFFECKER. I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

In line 6, page 88, after the word "Christiana," strike out the word "rivers" and insert the word "river."

Mr. HOFFECKER. There is only one Christiana River there. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURTON. Let me suggest to the gentleman from Delaware that there should be another amendment to that paragraph. The word "Delaware," in line 6, is the name of the State and not the name of a river.

Mr. HOFFECKER. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. BURTON. Then it should read:

Harbor at Wilmington and Christiana River, with a view to providing bulkheads for said harbor and river and widening and maintaining a channel 21 feet deep.

Mr. HOFFECKER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment suggested by the chairman of the committee will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFECKER. In line 7, page 88, after the word "said," insert "river and;" so that it will read "for said river and harbor."

Mr. BURTON. That was included in what I referred to a moment ago.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

GEORGIA.

Skiddaway Narrows, Chatham County: The Secretary of War is directed to cause a survey and an estimate of the cost of Skiddaway Narrows, connecting Isle of Hope River with Burnside River, for a channel 75 feet wide and 6 feet deep at mean low water, and make report of the same to the next session of Congress.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to that section.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 89, line 4, after the words "cost of," insert the word "improving."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

ILLINOIS.

Mississippi River at Moline, with a view to the construction of a lock.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after line 13, page 89, the following:

"Chicago River, with a view of determining the need, advisability, and estimated cost of constructing two turning basins in the north and south branches."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I suppose that it is almost useless for a member of the House now to hurl himself against the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, since during the six days of debate upon this bill not an amendment has been adopted unless urged by the chairman of that committee. Still, I am impelled to do so by the peculiar circumstances at Chicago. The Chicago Harbor is Chicago River. Last year there were more than 14,000 vessels in the total of entrances and clearances at the Chicago River.

Many of those vessels are the large vessels used in carrying grain in lake navigation, and not a single one of these vessels can turn around inside the north and south branches of the river, where the grain is taken on. So that all of these vessels entering the river and loading with grain are compelled to be hauled out of the river backward by the tugs. Since the drainage canal was opened there is a current in the river which was never known before, and now it is impossible to haul these vessels out without great expense. Every few days there is an accident, a collision between vessels or with some of the bridges or piers; and it is an

enormous expense to the people who are engaged in lake-carrying traffic. This amendment carries no appropriation.

I am perfectly willing to leave it to the future action of the River and Harbor Committee to decide whether the National Government ought to make this improvement or whether the local government ought to make the improvement. But in any event it will be necessary to have action by the engineer of the National Government for the purpose of locating where these turning basins are to be. It requires no expenditure of money to make this estimate. The local engineer, with the clerical force that he now has, will be able to perform this duty and make an estimate to Congress without any difficulty and without any additional expense.

Unless this improvement is made by some one, there will be the very greatest detriment to the lake carrying trade which emanates at Chicago. This carrying trade is enormous; and when I notice in this bill a provision for making the channel at New York Harbor 2,000 feet wide and another channel at Boston Harbor 1,500 feet in width for the foreign carrying trade I insist that it is but right that the carrying trade on the lakes at Chicago ought to have some place in which a vessel can turn around.

It is not with us a question of 2,000 feet or 1,500 feet in width. It only requires a widening in some particular spot. And when we propose to make a channel 3,000 feet wide in New York, Chicago has the right to have a proper place at which vessels may turn around, at least; and I insist that this sort of improvement should be made. More than 100,000,000 bushels of grain went from Chicago River this last year, and every bushel of it went in a vessel with an increased freight cost because that vessel had to pay a large amount to the tugs to haul her out of the river backward.

Such an improvement as this the chairman of the committee ought to be willing to concede to us. Chicago has not acted the beggar before Congress. We spent millions of dollars in the improvement of our river. We have spent \$40,000,000 in the construction of the drainage canal—largely in the improvement of the river within the limits of Chicago. We are now proposing to spend in that city millions of dollars in the reconstruction of our bridges, taking out the center-pier bridges and constructing bascule bridges.

The city of Chicago has to-day pending mandamus suits against the street-railway companies for the purpose of compelling them to lower the tunnels there. The only thing which we can not reach is the construction of turning basins. We can not locate them ourselves, even if we had the power and means to provide them, and all we ask now is that the Government engineer may be permitted to report to Congress upon the need and location of these basins; and I hope the committee may vote this into the bill.

I discussed this matter at greater length last Saturday in the general debate, and I think I then showed the most ample reasons for adopting the amendment now urged by me. I appeal to the chairman of the committee [Mr. BURTON] not to resist the amendment.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, there are two very valid reasons why this provision should not be inserted. In the last bill, 1899, a provision was inserted fixing the depth of the waters in Chicago at 21 feet, leaving with the city or sanitary district the responsibility of lowering certain tunnels which now make it absolutely impossible to obtain that depth. Now, we ought to wait and see what is done under that provision.

The second reason is this: In a very large majority of the harbors along the Great Lakes—I have sometimes stated that the proportion is nineteen-twentieths—the interior channels or harbors are improved by municipalities and private parties—that is, the General Government brings deep water up to the shore line of the lake, but the river, along the two sides of which the wharves are located, is improved by the municipality or by individuals. As to the main stem of the Chicago River, as well as the north branch and the south branch, there is an enormous commerce; and I do not say that the time will not come when the General Government ought to take some steps with reference to the improvement inside.

But if we were to insert this provision here for that survey as to these turning basins, in order to do justice (and in this bill we must do justice to all localities equally), there are at least 40 harbors on the lakes that we ought to turn to immediately and include. We ought to turn, for instance, to Milwaukee, Wis., which presents a stronger case than Chicago; we ought to turn to Buffalo, N. Y., which presents an equally strong case, where the city has not only dredged out the inner harbor, or creek forming that harbor, but, until attention was called to it here a few months ago, absolutely dredged between the Government piers on the outside.

We should also include Lorain, Ohio, where the municipality bonded itself for \$300,000 to make needed improvements and obtain in the river constituting its harbor a better depth than the Government had dredged between the piers extending into the lake. It would be unjust to other places. Without hesitancy I

say to the gentleman from Illinois, if he were to establish this precedent in all these other ports the share of Chicago in the national taxation which would be required for their payment would be more than the appropriation Chicago would receive.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows that I have no disposition to criticize the appropriation recommended by the committee for the large ports. Is not Buttermilk Channel situated within the limits of New York City?

Mr. BURTON. Not in the sense that this stream is. It is out in the general waterway to the ocean, bounded on one side by the city.

Mr. MANN. Is it not bounded on both sides by New York City?

Mr. BURTON. In the same sense that New York Bay is in New York.

Mr. MANN. I say that Buttermilk Channel is bounded on both sides by New York City.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman must examine his chart again.

Mr. MANN. Now, I think the gentleman from Ohio is right when he recommends the appropriation. I do not think he can draw the line fast absolutely. I think Buttermilk Channel ought to be improved, and I would suggest in reference to that that there may be a difference between the commerce of Chicago and some of the other ports that he has named.

Mr. BURTON. Let me call the gentleman's attention to another point in regard to Buttermilk Channel. It is not only justifiable because providing better means for reaching the largest warehouse district in the United States, but it facilitates the passage of vessels from New York Bay into the East River.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt of the wisdom of this appropriation, but I say it is within the limits of New York City. I think the chairman of the committee has stated repeatedly that he did not desire to say absolutely that an improvement should not be made because it was within the limits of the city. Now, the situation in Chicago is this: The current there is so fast that they can not turn around, and it is almost impossible to tow a vessel out. Why should not the engineers report where these turning places should be? No one else can locate them.

Mr. BURTON. I am decidedly opposed, Mr. Chairman, to farming out Government engineers for use in work which should be done by the municipalities.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be again reported, and I should like to be heard in favor of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will again be read.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I trust that this amendment will receive not only the friendly consideration but the unanimous approval of this committee. As my colleague has said, everyone who is familiar with the situation at Chicago knows that the Chicago River is not only the Chicago Harbor, but it is the only harbor in Chicago, the second city in population, the third city in tonnage, in the Union. More than that, the city of Chicago has grown up in this locality to be the second city in the country, not because it was located on a river, but because it was located on a harbor. Everyone who has been in Chicago must have seen the gigantic grain carriers being dragged by four tugs, two at each end, down the tortuous channel of the harbor, stern foremost, to clear water. The necessity for turning basins in the Chicago River can not be disputed.

Only two objections are presented by the chairman of the River and Harbor Committee to this amendment, and neither of them, it seems to me, will commend itself to the judgment of this committee. The first objection is that the amendment should not be adopted until the tunnels in the river have been lowered and the river has been deepened to 21 feet. It is true that three tunnels prevent navigation to a greater depth than 17 feet. It is true that Congress has by law established the depth of 21 feet, and it is either the duty of the Federal Government to see that these tunnels are removed, or it is the duty of the local authorities to remove them. In either case the channel of the river in the harbor at Chicago should be deepened, but that is entirely a separate proposition from the establishment of the turning basins.

These turning basins are as much needed with the present depth of water as they would be with a depth of 21 feet. The second objection to the amendment made by the chairman of the committee is that there are other harbors that need similar turning basins. I take it that every locality where improvements in harbors are needed has its able advocate on the floor of this House, and the fact that similar improvements are needed elsewhere should not prejudice the claim of Chicago at this time.

In connection with the second objection, the chairman of the committee makes the point that the Chicago Harbor is entirely within the limits of the municipality. This objection, taken in

connection with certain remarks made by the chairman in explaining this bill, on the 9th of this month, shows a dangerous tendency on his part toward the adoption of a policy which would be prejudicial to the interests of almost every harbor in the United States.

On January 9, as I find by referring to page 819 of the RECORD, the chairman of the committee said:

While not attempting to enforce any hard-and-fast rule, the committee have sought to make one which shall create some boundary line between the municipalities and the General Government. We have tried, however, to judge each case according to its merit. In some cases there is no opportunity for an outer harbor, and there must be an improvement of the inner harbor. In that case it makes a strong showing for an appropriation within, which otherwise would not exist.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentlemen of this committee whether they wish to adopt the policy enunciated there—that a harbor which is entirely within the limits of a municipality has no claims upon the Federal Government.

Then on January 14, as appears on page 1076 of the RECORD, the following colloquy took place between the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OTJEN] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]:

Mr. OTJEN. Is there anything in this bill making appropriation for the purpose of improving an inner harbor or harbors lying within the city line of any city?

Mr. BURTON. There are one or two cases where improvements have been under way for many years. There is one case at Calumet River. That, however, is an interstate stream, and provision is made for dredging to the Indiana line. But the committee have avoided as far as possible on the balance of the Great Lakes making provision for dredging interior streams.

Mr. OTJEN. As I understand the chairman of the committee, it is the policy of the committee not to make such appropriation.

Mr. BURTON. The committee, I should say in frankness, had some difficulty in the matter, but we pursued that course.

Now, as I look over the present river and harbor bill and former measures of the same character, I see evidences of the growth of this dangerous tendency to apply this principle to the harbors of the Great Lakes and to withhold the application of the principle from the harbors on salt water.

Mr. BURTON. Does not the gentleman know that until the case of the Calumet River arose a few years ago there was practically no harbor on the Great Lakes where the inner portion was improved by the General Government? When that has been a fact for fifty years, how can he now recognize a "dangerous tendency?"

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. Quite true. But I protest against this dangerous tendency to further strengthen and extend a policy of not improving fresh-water interior harbors while improving salt-water interior harbors. Why should salt-water harbors be given any preference over fresh-water harbors of equal or greater commercial importance? The Federal Government should provide a 21-foot channel in the Chicago River and construct a turning basin on each of the branches of the river. Judging from the action of Congress in the past, it is safe to say that if Chicago and its river had been located on the Atlantic coast ten dollars would have been expended on the Chicago harbor for every dollar that it has actually received from the Federal Government.

Mr. REEVES. If my colleague will allow me, I want to suggest for his information and for that of members of the House that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has not established a proposition that the General Government shall not improve that portion of harbors wholly within corporate limits. On the contrary, it has almost unanimously decided the other way. That question is not necessarily involved here, and I do hope that my friend may not anticipate that trouble.

Before taking my seat, I may say that is a question involving a policy to which I trust members of the House will not commit themselves without proper thought and investigation, for it affects the whole country. All over this country, particularly in New England, the inner harbors have been improved from time immemorial by the General Government. That is the record of legislation on this subject.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. I thank my colleague for his suggestion, and I would say in explanation that I am quoting the language of the chairman of this committee in his argument on this bill and in opposition to the pending amendment, as showing what I consider a dangerous tendency on his part to discriminate against the harbors on the Great Lakes.

Now, the Federal Government, it seems to me, has a peculiar care over these rivers and harbors of the Great Lakes. I wish to call attention to a few lines in the ordinance of 1787 for the government of the Northwest Territory, within the boundaries of which this harbor is situated.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BURTON. I move that debate on this paragraph be closed. Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that my colleague be allowed to proceed for five minutes more.

Mr. BURTON. I think I must object.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. I wish merely to refer—

Mr. BURTON. Can not the gentleman have that matter printed in the RECORD without reading? How long a time does the gentleman wish to occupy?

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. About two minutes.

Mr. BURTON. Very well; just read that paragraph; I will not object to that.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. And I hope the gentleman will not object to my making a word of comment upon it.

In the ordinance of 1787 I find the following language:

The navigable waters leading into the Mississippi and St. Lawrence and the carrying places between the same shall be common highways and forever free, as well to the inhabitants of the said Territory as to the citizens of the United States.

Now, the Chicago Harbor by nature flowed into the St. Lawrence. Through the enterprise of our citizens and the expenditure of nearly \$40,000,000 we have made the river flow into the Mississippi or into the St. Lawrence, as we may choose. Under these circumstances, I maintain that this House shall not commit itself to a policy of improving rivers that are not harbors and improving harbors that are not rivers while it withholds Federal aid from a body of water like the Chicago River, which is both a river and a harbor. I hope this amendment will be unanimously adopted.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The question was taken; and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the other amendment sent up by the chairman of the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert, in line 13, page 89, after the word "lock," the following: "Ohio River channels at or near Mound City and Elizabethtown."

Mr. BURTON. I will state, Mr. Chairman, in reference to this amendment, that we thought it proper that these two points should be provided for in the bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Kentucky: Tradewater River.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move the amendment I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the words "Trade Water River," in line 15, on page 89 of the bill, insert "Salt River from its mouth to Sheppardsville."

Mr. BURTON. I would like to ask the gentleman as to whether that river has not been surveyed recently?

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. No, sir. It was surveyed about thirteen years ago—in 1887, I think.

Mr. BURTON. I may be mistaken in my impression, but I had an idea it had been surveyed. Is not this the river that Mr. Carlisle said the only way to improve it was to pave it? [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I do not remember, but I suspect he would say that now. [Laughter.]

Mr. BURTON. Is it not true that numerous people who go up that river do not get down again? [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Well, I think that would be a very favorable recommendation for the amendment I have suggested. I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. BURTON. Has the gentleman examined the condition of the commerce upon that river?

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. In 1887, the year that this examination was made, the commerce was something over a half million of dollars. It has increased since that time.

Mr. BURTON. I think I will make no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The amendment was considered, and agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

LOUISIANA.

Cane River, with a view to the improvement of the same by a system of locks and dams.

Bayou Tigre, Vermilion Parish.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by inserting, after line 19, the words "Bayou Grossetete."

The CHAIRMAN. The question will be submitted, and the Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. BURTON. I will say, Mr. Chairman, that a partial examination has been made of this bayou, and it is deemed advisable, in view of the representations made by the engineers, to continue the work.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be adopted.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman from

Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] desired to offer an amendment at this point.

Mr. BROUSSARD. The amendment I had in view, Mr. Chairman, was the one offered by the chairman of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

MAINE.

Medomac River to the head of navigation.

Mr. BURTON. On behalf of the committee I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after line 13, page 90, "Ile au Haut thoroughfare, between the island of Ile au Haut and Kimballs Island."

The amendment was considered, and agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

MARYLAND.

Havre de Grace Harbor.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out line 15 on page 90.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out "Havre de Grace Harbor."

Mr. BURTON. I move that that be stricken out and an insertion be made providing for "the Severn River to and including Annapolis Harbor."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the additional amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out line 15, page 90, and insert "Severn River to and including Annapolis Harbor."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

MISSOURI.

Missouri Chute, in the Mississippi River, with a view to closing the same.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting after the word "same," in line 9, page 92, the following:

"Provided, That if upon the preliminary survey the proposed work be deemed advisable such amount of the sum herein appropriated for the improvement of the Mississippi River from the mouth of the Ohio River to St. Paul as may be necessary shall be used in making said improvement."

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, that provision ought not to be adopted. The law is as it should be—that a preliminary examination shall first be made and then a survey. When both these are before us we make the appropriation. It would be changing that salutary provision so that in this case the successive steps would not have to be taken at all. This project would be altogether in advance of any other project in the bill, and would be on an entirely different footing.

I will say to the gentleman, however, that I do not believe his provision is necessary. If in the general improvement of the river some work is required there, no doubt it will be done.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. Chairman, I will state that my purpose in offering that amendment at this time is to direct attention to that particular point. If upon a preliminary survey the work be deemed advisable, as the chairman of the River and Harbor Committee has stated, they could use a part of the general appropriation for the improvement of the Mississippi River from the mouth of the Ohio to St. Paul. They could use it without the amendment, if they were disposed to do it, but they may not do it. Now, by waiting, after the preliminary survey has been made, until another survey shall be made the property of the individual owners there will be destroyed. I understand that the property owners have no right to protect their own property. The river there belongs to the Government. They have not the right to close up this chute, they have not the right to protect the banks.

As I stated yesterday, it will not only preserve the property there in the river bottom, the richest land in Missouri, but it will preserve and protect a little town of two or three hundred inhabitants which is threatened with destruction. Not only that, it will improve the channel of the river there, which is very shallow, by compelling all the water to go on one side of that island. I do not see why the chairman of the committee should object to this amendment. It does not ask for any additional appropriation. It does not interfere in any manner with the survey. After the preliminary survey is made, if there is a report in favor of the improvement, the parties engaged in the work could direct the making of the improvement under the general appropriation, and a part of the general fund, perhaps \$10,000, would be used in closing up Missouri Chute.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to reoffer the amendment which was considered yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert in line 14, page 92, the following:

"The Mississippi River Commission shall examine and report upon the feasibility of the establishment of a system of reservoirs to be located in the St. Francis Basin, which reservoirs shall be large enough to cut some 10 feet off the top of the greatest floods at the junction of the Mississippi and Ohio rivers, or to reduce the extreme flood level to about the equivalent of a 42-foot stage on the gauge at Cairo."

Mr. BURTON. Does that contain both the words "feasible" and "advisable?"

Mr. BARTHOLDT. No; only "feasible."

Mr. BURTON. It does not require them to make any estimate?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. No; it is modified in accordance with the suggestion of the gentleman yesterday.

Mr. BURTON. I see no objection to it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, there is no necessity of putting that in this bill at all. It will involve an expenditure of perhaps \$100,000,000 to buy the farms on the territory inside of that basin.

Mr. BURTON. I will answer that for the gentleman from Missouri that I think the case is this: Certain business men, and even scientific men in the Mississippi Valley, have been agitating this as a method of diminishing the flood waters of the Mississippi. I do not understand that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] commits himself to that project, but he desires a scientific report upon it. The Mississippi River Commission is not compelled to make any estimates or do any considerable amount of work. I can see no objection to it.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Herman Harbor.

Mr. BURTON. I want to ask the gentleman from Missouri who represents that district whether the work "Herman" is spelled with one or two n's?

Mr. CLARK. Two n's.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection that correction will be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON. In the next line, line 16, there is somewhat more considerable change, "Caw River." I wish to insert "at the mouth" of "Kaw" instead of "Caw" River.

Mr. COWHERD. If the chairman of the committee would permit me, I would much prefer that it should be "at or near" the mouth.

Mr. BURTON. I have no objection to that. I move, Mr. Chairman, that it read "Kaw River, at or near the mouth."

Mr. COWHERD. I would suggest to the chairman that the mouth of the river is in Kansas. I notice that it is put under the head of "Missouri."

Mr. BURTON. I fear we are making an error, Mr. Chairman, as to the State in which the mouth of Kaw River is located.

Mr. COWHERD. The mouth of the Kaw River is in Kansas.

Mr. BURTON. A more considerable change is required. The first amendment, as to Hermann, has been adopted, I understand.

The CHAIRMAN. That has been adopted.

Mr. BURTON. I move here, in place of Kaw River, line 16, the following be adopted: "Kaw River at or near the mouth;" and that it be transposed to another head, to occur on page 89, just before the word "Kentucky," with these words: "Kansas. Kaw River at or near the mouth."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment suggested by the chairman of the committee will be adopted. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

New York.

Mr. BURTON. There is an amendment there at the beginning.

Mr. SCUDDER. I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert in line 11, page 93, after the words "deep-draft vessels," the words "Northville, Lucas landing, Suffolk County, in Long Island Sound, with a view to constructing a breakwater."

Mr. BURTON. One thing I desire to say. That ought to come in at the beginning, after the words "New York," after line 21, page 92.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hudson River, from State dam at Troy to Waterford; preliminary examination is directed to be made, with a view to securing a depth of 12 feet of water, including a lock at the State dam of size and capacity sufficient to accommodate all probable demands of commerce.

Mr. BURTON. I have an amendment I desire to offer there.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after line 2, page 93, the following:

"A preliminary examination is also directed to be made between Troy and Coeymans."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment I desire to offer.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at end of line 2, page 93, the following:

"Port Jefferson Harbor, Suffolk County, N. Y., with a view to constructing a channel through the inlet thereto 15 feet in depth at mean low water and 200 feet in width."

[Mr. SCUDDER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. BURTON. I trust the amendment will not be adopted. There is a very large coast line there, it is true.

The question was taken; and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

East Chester Creek.

Mr. SCUDDER. I have an amendment to offer.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at end of line 4, page 93, the following:

"Jacksons Creek, Nassau County, from Bellmore Dock to the bay, with a view to constructing a channel therein 6 feet in depth at mean low water and 150 feet in width."

[Mr. SCUDDER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ticonderoga River.

Mr. SCUDDER. I have another amendment to offer.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at end of line 3, page 93, the following:

"Parsonage Cove, Nassau County, from Baldwin's three-quarters of a mile southerly to deep water, with a view to constructing a channel 8 feet in depth at mean low water and 200 feet in width."

[Mr. SCUDDER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The question was taken; and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mamaroneck Harbor.

Mr. SCUDDER. I have another amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at end of line 5, page 93, the following:

"Three-Mile Harbor, East Hampton, N. Y., with a view to constructing a channel through the inlet thereto not less than 10 feet in depth at mean low water and 200 feet in width."

[Mr. SCUDDER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Oleott Harbor, Lake Ontario.

Mr. SCUDDER. I have an amendment there, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at end of line 6, page 93, the following:

"Hempstead Harbor from the inlet at Barrow Beach to Roslyn, with a view to constructing a channel 12 feet in depth at mean low water and 200 feet in width."

[Mr. SCUDDER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and the amendment was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. CAPRON having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, sundry messages in writing from the President were communicated to the House by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On January 11, 1901:

H. R. 13394. An act providing for the payment of electoral messengers.

On January 14, 1901:

H. J. Res. 277. Joint resolution authorizing the appointment of Charles A. Boutelle as a captain on the retired list of the Navy;

H. J. Res. 101. Joint resolution authorizing the publication of an edition of "A digest of international law;"

H. R. 4099. An act for the relief of the Marion Trust Company, administrator of the estate of Samuel Milliken, deceased;

H. R. 11588. An act permitting the building of a bridge across the Osage River at the city of Warsaw, Benton County, Mo.;

H. R. 6344. An act to remove the charges of desertion from the records of the Department against Frederick Mehring;

H. R. 12447. An act to amend an act approved June 1, A. D. 1900, entitled "An act to create the southern division of the southern district of Iowa for judicial purposes, and to fix the time and place for holding court therein;"

H. R. 163. An act for the relief of Henry O. Morse;
 H. R. 2955. An act providing for the resurvey of township No. 30 west, of the sixth principal meridian, in Frontier County, State of Nebraska;
 H. R. 11213. An act for the relief of occupants of lands included in the Algodones grant, in Arizona;
 H. R. 1288. An act granting a pension to Cornelius W. Roberts;
 H. R. 6424. An act granting a pension to Charles S. Devine;
 H. R. 8207. An act granting a pension to Joseph Quinn;
 H. R. 9176. An act granting a pension to Emily Haines Harrison;
 H. R. 9719. An act granting a pension to Amos W. Felker;
 H. R. 10743. An act granting a pension to Augusta Ullman;
 H. R. 315. An act granting an increase of pension to Moses H. Taber;
 H. R. 6096. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Kirkendall;
 H. R. 6947. An act granting an increase of pension to Alonzo C. Rembaugh;
 H. R. 7012. An act granting an increase of pension to Emma C. Stephenson;
 H. R. 7190. An act granting an increase of pension to George O. Cole;
 H. R. 7328. An act granting an increase of pension to John Nicklin;
 H. R. 7553. An act granting an increase of pension to Fannie M. O'Linn;
 H. R. 7600. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Claussen;
 H. R. 8735. An act granting an increase of pension to Annie B. Sharrard;
 H. R. 9010. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Westfield;
 H. R. 9555. An act granting an increase of pension to Nicholas Briggeman;
 H. R. 10381. An act granting an increase of pension to Gideon W. T. Ridlon;
 H. R. 10524. An act granting an increase of pension to Lewis H. Riden;
 H. R. 10778. An act granting an increase of pension to Martin V. B. Winkler;
 H. R. 10847. An act granting an increase of pension to Betsey A. Summers;
 H. R. 11552. An act granting an increase of pension to Louis Hebel.
 On January 15, 1901:
 H. R. 1803. An act granting a pension to Julia E. G. Lewis;
 H. R. 4679. An act granting a pension to Micager Philpot;
 H. R. 8218. An act granting a pension to Mary E. Lacey;
 H. R. 8540. An act granting a pension to Lydia J. De Silva;
 H. R. 10749. An act granting a pension to Henry L. White; and
 H. R. 10750. An act granting a pension to James H. Rainey.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

Oswego Harbor, with a view to ascertaining cost of necessary repairs to breakwater.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at end of line 7, page 93, the following:

"Jones Inlet from the head of the lead to deep water west of Babylon, in the Great South Bay, Suffolk County."

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk (proceeding with the reading of the bill) read as follows:

Erie Basin and Black Rock Harbor, with a view to obtaining a suitable channel for deep-draft vessels.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert, at the end of line 9, page 93, the following:

"Greenport Harbor, Suffolk County, with a view to determine and to submit an estimate of the cost of deepening the anchorage ground in Sterling Basin, in said harbor, and widening and deepening the approaches to said basin."

[Mr. SCUDDER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading of the bill.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask a transposition of the titles so that they may come in alphabetical order, so that Ohio may come before Oregon.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the transposition will be made.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. CAPRON having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. CUNNINGHAM, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. 5549. An act granting an increase of pension to Horatio N. Davis; and

S. 5395. An act to authorize the United New Jersey Railroad and Canal Company and the Philadelphia and Trenton Railroad Company, or their successors, to construct and maintain a bridge across the Delaware River.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 10498) to create a new division in the western judicial district of the State of Missouri; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 953) to divide the State of West Virginia into two judicial districts.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

Canal and locks at Willamette Falls, Willamette River, Oregon: The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to ascertain, through a board of engineers, or otherwise, and report to the House, whether the acquisition of the present canal and locks at Willamette Falls, Oregon, or a construction of new canal and locks by the United States Government, and their operation for the exclusive benefit of the navigation of said river, would, by withdrawing the waters of the Willamette River from the channels in which they have been accustomed to flow, or otherwise, injure in a material manner the operations of the manufacturing enterprises now in operation or contemplated at the falls of the Willamette River. Also to ascertain, through the Department of Justice, or otherwise, and report to Congress, whether the Portland General Electric Light Company of Oregon, by virtue of its ownership of certain real property at Willamette Falls, in the Willamette River, Oregon, has a legal, valid, and existing right and title, as against the United States, for the full, free, and continued use of the waters of the Willamette River for the use of the manufacturing enterprises now located on their property, whether such water is needed for navigation or not, and if so, what method would be necessary on the part of the United States Government to acquire title to such water for the purpose of navigation, and the measure of damages it must pay to such company.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to suggest to the gentleman from Ohio whether it would not be better, in line 4, page 94, to strike out the word "House" and insert the word "Congress."

Mr. BURTON. I do not think it matters about that; the report is naturally addressed to the Speaker of the House. The gentleman will see that the documents which come here are addressed to the Speaker and are labeled "House documents."

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

Port Clinton Harbor.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out in line 7, page 95, "Port Clinton Harbor" and insert "Portage River to Oak Harbor Bridge."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURTON. I have also another amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after line 7, page 95, after the word "Harbor," the words "Pennsylvania, and Susquehanna River from its source to the junction of north and west branches at Northumberland."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURTON. Now I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that, the transposition having been made between Oregon and Ohio, the item as to Pennsylvania should come after Oregon, and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in that order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that will be done.

There was no objection.

The Clerk (proceeding with the reading of the bill) read as follows:

Inner Winyah Bay, with a view to securing a depth of 20 feet from the boundary line of the city of Georgetown on the west to the shore line of Black and Waccamaw rivers on the north and east, and the shore of Winyah Bay and Sampit River on the west, south, and southeast.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert, after line 3, page 96, after the word "southeast," the words "Edisto River from its mouth to the boundary of Aiken County."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk (proceeding with the reading of the bill) read as follows:

TEXAS.

Matagorda Bay and Lavaca Bay, with a view to securing a channel 6 feet in depth and 100 feet in width between said bays.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, in line 8, page 96, I move to amend by striking out the word "six," after the word "channel,"

and inserting the word "nine." There is already a channel 6 feet deep.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk (proceeding with the reading of the bill) read as follows:

VIRGINIA.

Alexandria Harbor, with a view to improving the channel in Hunting Creek and across the flats.
Coan Creek.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, in line 13, page 97, I move to strike out the word "Creek" and insert the word "River," so that it will read "Coan River."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that amendment will be adopted.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON. I also offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

WASHINGTON.

Insert in line 13, page 97, after the word "Creek," now changed to "River," the following: "Nooksack River, with a view to constructing a dam to divert the flow of the river into Bellingham Bay."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the amendment just adopted insert the words "Ship canal to connect Puget Sound with Grays Harbor, via the Chehalis River."

Mr. JONES of Washington. This, Mr. Chairman, is a most important matter to my State. We have secured one survey today. We have several thousand miles of salt-water coast line. This survey is asked for by the legislature of the State, and, as I have said, we have but one other provided. A resolution providing for this has passed the Senate, and we hope it will be placed upon this bill.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I also indorse all that my colleague says. This is a most meritorious proposition, one of great importance to our State, and should be adopted.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, if there is any one absurdity to which we have committed ourselves in the past, it is the building of canals where nature never intended there should be a waterway. The fact that the State of Washington has these thousands of miles of seacoast of which the gentleman speaks is one of the very strongest arguments against his suggestion, and shows that they do not need canals.

The best place to build a canal is where there is a natural waterway. Let the canals go alongside of it to correct the errors in the way of descent from level to level and run around shoals and other obstructions which are not readily removable. But to construct such a canal as this proposed in the pending amendment would be simply an enormous expenditure of money without the development of any satisfactory result. It would cost millions upon millions of dollars and would result in no benefit whatever. You could not offer facilities enough to force commerce, which can go by the regular and natural lines to adopt such a course as you propose in this amendment.

I have strenuously opposed this class of projects. I have been frequently requested to introduce a resolution for the construction of a canal between Lake Erie and the Ohio River in my own State, and I have always refused.

There was a project some years ago to build a canal connecting the upper end of Lake Michigan and the western end of Lake Erie, and yet if such a canal had been built nine-tenths, or more probably ninety-nine one-hundredths, of the traffic would still continue to follow the natural waterway, although the old route would be considerably longer.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, let us finish the work upon which we are now engaged, and not enter upon new projects that are in their nature doubtful and unnecessary. It may be said that this is only a preliminary survey; but when you order a survey it is an intimation that there is an intention in the legislative mind at some time to do the work.

I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment offered by the chairman of the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the words "West Virginia. Little Kanawha River," insert "with a view of continuing improvements thereof up to Burnsville."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

A new section to be added to the bill, as follows:

"Waterway connection, Puget Sound with Lakes Union and Washing-

ton: Continuing the improvement of the construction and excavation of the waterway between Puget Sound and Lakes Union and Washington, \$100,000."

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is entirely out of place here. I have no objection to the gentleman discussing it, except for the consumption of time. We have spent a great deal of time on this bill already.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CUSHMAN. During the time that we were discussing the paragraph relating to Washington, to which this amendment refers, I called upon the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. CAPRON], then acting as temporary chairman of the committee, and asked him when would be the proper time to offer the amendment which I desire to submit. He said at the close of the bill.

Now, I do not make that statement for the purpose of placing the responsibility upon the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. CAPRON], but to show that I had exhibited no negligence in offering the amendment at the proper time and the proper place.

I now ask unanimous consent to offer the amendment and also to address the committee for one minute thereon.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to address himself to the proposed amendment for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUSHMAN. I do not desire to make any lengthy address on the subject, because of the fact that the project embraced in this amendment was discussed fully in the remarks I submitted the other day. But I wish only to say that this ship canal proposed to be constructed at Seattle is a project to which the Government stands committed; that it has been indorsed by the engineers; that the Government has already made an appropriation of \$175,000 to help carry that project forward to its conclusion.

The statement has been made upon this floor that inasmuch as an appropriation of \$175,000 was made some five years ago and that we have only expended \$5,000, leaving a balance of \$170,000, there is no occasion for an additional appropriation. The truth about that is that the original appropriation of \$175,000 was made upon the condition that the people of King County procure the right of way for that canal before they could expend any of the money.

For four years they have been putting forth their energy and spending the money to acquire that right of way. They have acquired the right of way, they have deeded it to the Government, and the Government has accepted the deed. Now, here is a proposition that is so vast that an additional appropriation of \$100,000 is not only advisable but absolutely necessary. Time after time and time after time this committee has made provision for various projects covered by this bill in cases where there were unexpended appropriations on hand, and which could be expended.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, this is a proposition of such importance that I can not let it pass by in a minute. It is a project, uncommon in its nature, for providing a fresh-water basin near to a salt-water port, and for providing water of a uniform level into which boats may come for mooring from a port where the range of the tide is from 11 to 18 feet. Now, I think in the first place, when we classify improvements into necessities, comforts, and luxuries, that is a luxury.

Mr. CUSHMAN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CUSHMAN. For what period of time is the gentleman recognized in opposition to this matter?

The CHAIRMAN. On the point of order the gentleman is recognized for such length of time as the Chairman chooses to hear him.

Mr. BURTON. I understood, Mr. Chairman, that the point of order had been waived and that the gentleman obtained unanimous consent to have his amendment pending. I did not object to his having unanimous consent.

Mr. CUSHMAN. That is true.

Mr. BURTON. I expect to occupy only five minutes. I think I can show the salient features of this project inside of five minutes, if the gentleman will not interrupt me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair supposed the gentleman had obtained consent to address the committee on the merits of the proposition, but that the point of order had not been waived. It is entirely agreeable to the Chair, however—

Mr. BURTON. I understand that this proposition that \$100,000 be appropriated for this project is now pending before this committee, that the gentleman from Washington has spoken in favor of it, and that I am now recognized for five minutes to speak against it.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Is that with any understanding with reference to time in which to reply?

Mr. BURTON. I will be frank with the gentleman and say

that I shall ask that the debate close when I get through with my five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rules of the House when an amendment is offered five minutes are allowed to the proposer of the amendment and five minutes to the party opposed to it, at which time it is supposed that a vote will be taken. The gentleman from Washington has spoken in favor of his amendment, and the gentleman from Ohio rises to oppose it and is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, if we are to provide a fresh-water basin to take off barnacles from vessels entering the port of Seattle why should we not make a similar provision at New York, Boston, New Orleans, and the other great seaports of the country? Gentlemen will do well to consider the matter carefully before establishing such a precedent. Then it is proposed here to take a part of a salt-water bay, known as Salmon Bay, raise the level of the upper part of the bay, and make the water on that upper level or reach fresh, while that below remains salt.

I do not believe it is a practicable idea. Then they propose by locks and dams to connect this upper portion of the bay with Lakes Union and Washington, which contain fresh water and are located near Seattle. I want to call attention to the fact that if the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN] will study his own project a little more thoroughly he will find this appropriation will do him no good, and I will tell him why. There was an order made for a survey very objectionable, because it did not call for a report upon the feasibility or advisability of the project, but to report the most feasible and advisable route from Salmon Bay to Lakes Union and Washington.

What did they advise in the way of locks? Locks 400 feet long, providing for a draft of 26 feet. And Mr. Hill is now building in Connecticut, to sail from this port, two boats 632 feet long and with a draft of 32½ feet. So what good would their projects do? They call for locks 400 feet long and 26 feet deep, entirely insufficient for the very boats that need them. They would come here simply asking for another and more expensive project. No good will be done by appropriating \$100,000. Do not let us delude ourselves. The whole \$2,900,000 would be so much money thrown away. They would come here and say: "That project is not sufficient; we must have another project that will provide for up-to-date boats."

From every standpoint, then, Mr. Chairman, comparing this project with others, the practicability of the general scheme and the practicability of this special scheme, this improvement is objectionable and should not be adopted.

I want to say that no one has more admiration for the port of Seattle, more interest as to its future greatness, than I have; but they should not have selected it out for that kind of improvements which we have not made elsewhere in the country. I move that debate upon this amendment be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the adoption of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

WISCONSIN.

Harbor at South Milwaukee: Resurvey, with a view to the modification of the present plan of said harbor, and with a view of ascertaining the feasibility and advisability of the construction of a harbor suitable for the needs of commerce at said port, with plans and estimates of the same.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to insert after line 21, as a separate item, "Harbor at Fort Washington."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill, with amendments, to the House, with the recommendation that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. CUSHMAN. I move an amendment to that motion. I move that the committee report this bill back to the House with the recommendation to recommit the same to the River and Harbor Committee.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I take it that that motion is not in order in Committee of the Whole. [After a pause.] Mr. Chairman, in order to save time I ask for a vote. I waive all points of order—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was having the authorities examined to see whether the motion of the gentleman from Washington would interfere with the motion of the gentleman from Ohio. It is not treated as a motion to amend. The question is as to which motion would have precedence. The Chair will rule that the motion of the gentleman from Ohio has precedence, and will put the motion of the gentleman. The motion is that the committee now rise and report the bill, with the amendments that have been adopted by the committee, with the recommendation

that the amendments be agreed to in the House and that the bill as amended do pass.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CUSHMAN. I ask for a division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 185, noes 2.

So the motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOPKINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13189, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be adopted and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will submit the amendments in gross.

The amendments were agreed to in gross.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SULZER. I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington moves that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CUSHMAN. I ask for a roll call—the yeas and nays.

The question was taken on ordering the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Six gentlemen have arisen—not a sufficient number, evidently, and the yeas and nays are refused. The noes have it, and the motion to recommit is rejected. The question now is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I call for the yeas and nays on the final passage of the bill.

The question was taken on ordering the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Thirteen gentlemen have arisen, evidently not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

The question was taken on the passage of the bill, and the bill was passed. [Loud applause.]

On motion of Mr. BURTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The following messages from the President of the United States were severally read, ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report of the Secretary of Agriculture on the work and expenditures of the agricultural experiment stations established under the act of Congress of March 2, 1887, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1900, in accordance with the act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the said fiscal year.

The attention of Congress is called to the request of the Secretary of Agriculture that 3,000 copies of the report be printed for the use of the Department of Agriculture.

WILLIAM McKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, January 16, 1901.

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a fourth report on the investigations of the agricultural capabilities of Alaska for the year 1900, in accordance with the acts of Congress making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1900, and June 30, 1901.

Attention is called to the request of the Secretary of Agriculture that if this report is published by Congress 2,000 copies be printed for the use of the Department of Agriculture.

WILLIAM McKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, January 16, 1901.

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, in which he presents a preliminary report of investigations upon the forests of the southern Appalachian mountain region. Upon the basis of the facts established by this investigation, the Secretary of Agriculture recommends the purchase of land for a national forest reserve in western North Carolina, eastern Tennessee, and adjacent States. I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the reasons upon which this recommendation rests.

WILLIAM McKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, January 16, 1901.

INAUGURATION EXPENSES, MARCH 4, 1901.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations to report back Senate joint resolution 142, and I am directed to ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution which the Clerk will report to the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution to enable the Secretary of the Senate to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President and Vice-President of the United States, March 4, 1901.

Resolved, etc., That to enable the Secretary of the Senate to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President and Vice-President of the United States March 4, 1901, in accordance with the programme adopted by the committee of arrangements appointed under resolution of the Senate of the 11th day of December, 1900, including the pay for extra police for three days, at \$3 per day, there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, the same to be immediately available.

With the following amendments recommended by the committee:

In line 5 strike out the words "and Vice-President."

In line 8, after the word "with," strike out all down to and including the word "hundred," in line 9, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Such programme as may be adopted by a joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, to be appointed under a concurrent resolution of the two Houses."

In line 12 strike out the word "five" and insert the word "seven."

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to enable the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States March 4, 1901."

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the resolution read as it will be when amended.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now read the resolution as it will be when amended.

The Clerk read the resolution as it would read as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. BINGHAM. Very well.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Why does the name of the Vice-President not appear?

Mr. BINGHAM. Because the Committee on Appropriations followed literally the instructions of the House, and if the gentleman desires I will read to him from the RECORD:

Mr. DALZELL. I move to recommit to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report a resolution providing for the expenses of the inauguration of the President of the United States, to be had under a programme subject to arrangements to be made by a joint committee of the House and Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to recommit with instructions that the Committee on Appropriations report back a resolution providing for the inauguration of the President of the United States. Does he include the Vice-President?

Mr. DALZELL. No.

The SPEAKER (continuing). The President of the United States, under the superintendence of a joint committee of the House and Senate.

The question was taken; and the motion to recommit was agreed to.

I submit that the committee followed the instructions of the House because your committee had no other authority. But I am authorized by the unanimous vote of the Committee on Appropriations to state to the House that there should be, in accordance with their judgment, such action on the part of the House that instead of striking out the words "Vice-President" to insert it in the title, and so far as the body of the resolution is concerned to insert it. That is the direction of the committee.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. It seems to me that that would be much better than as reported by the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, your committee has followed the instructions of the House. As I have just stated, the committee is of the opinion that where the word "Vice-President" occurs in the joint resolution it should be retained. I have consulted with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] who submitted the motion for recommitment, and he sees no objection to it, and as there was some objection on the right of me yesterday, in connection with the ceremonies pertaining to the Vice-Presidency and incurring expenses therewith, I trust the gentleman has no objection. I ask that in the report of the committee, so far as the preamble is concerned, that the word "Vice-President" may be inserted, and also that in line 4, after the word "President," the words "and Vice-President" may be inserted, or the House nonconcur in the amendments, thereby retaining the word "Vice-President" where it occurs in the Senate joint resolution.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thought the gentleman was instructed to report a proposition directly opposite to that which he now proposes. The gentleman's position seems to me to be somewhat singular. He was instructed by this House to make a particular report. That was by almost a unanimous vote. He makes the report and now proposes to modify the report and go back to the original proposition substantially.

Mr. BINGHAM. If the gentleman will allow me, I have said that the Committee on Appropriations makes a report in accordance with the order of the House—a direct literal following of the House instruction. I have further said that I am instructed by the Committee on Appropriations, by the unanimous action of the committee, to submit to the House an amendment in refer-

ence to the ceremony pertaining to the inaugural of the Vice-President. I am obeying simply the instructions of the committee. It is the right of the House to vote down the amendment I have submitted. I obey my committee in submitting it to the House.

Mr. HEPBURN. In other words, the committee makes a report complying with the demands of the House, and another report directly opposed to the command of the House.

Mr. BINGHAM. No; not at all. We comply with the specific instructions of the House, to the effect that we have brought in this resolution. That I will follow with a concurrent resolution whereby the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall be called upon to appoint a committee of three from each House to carry out the details of the joint resolution.

Under the rulings heretofore made that must come as a concurrent resolution. If the gentleman from Iowa objects, it is for the House to determine whether they will include the words "and the Vice-President." The real contention, and the vote taken yesterday, was that there should be a committee of the two Houses, and not to leave the matter exclusively with the Senate. In other words, there should be a joint committee of the two Houses in making arrangements for the inaugural ceremonies pertaining to the President.

Mr. HEPBURN. If the gentleman will permit me, I think he is mistaken as to the action of the House. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] moved his instructions that the committee should report a bill omitting the words "the Vice-President of the United States." He was asked specifically if he proposed that. He stated that he did, and, the House being thus informed, I presume voted understandingly to instruct the Committee on Appropriations to report such a bill. Now the gentleman says that he does that.

Mr. BINGHAM. I do.

Mr. HEPBURN (continuing). Yet at the same time he says that he reports unanimously from the committee another proposition that the words the House moved to strike out shall be inserted in the bill.

Mr. BINGHAM. The committee has literally complied with the instructions of the House.

Mr. HEPBURN. By making two reports, one in favor of and one against.

Mr. BINGHAM. I have submitted, in accordance with the rules of the House, the written report in accordance with the instruction given to the committee by the House. That report is before the House. It was read, and is here now for consideration and action.

Now, I make a separate verbal submission to the House—

Mr. HEPBURN (interrupting). At the instance of the committee?

Mr. BINGHAM. That is from the committee. The verbal submission that after an examination of the question the committee is of the opinion, unanimously, that the words "Vice-President" should be included; in other words, that the ceremonies attendant upon his inauguration should form a part of what we may call the arrangements, so far as the joint committee can arrange, for these inaugural ceremonies.

Mr. HEPBURN. Let me see if I understand the gentleman's proposition. He has brought in two reports—

Mr. BINGHAM. No; one report and a verbal submission—

Mr. HEPBURN (continuing). One report and the other is a report in the nature of a verbal submission, as he calls it, one for and one against what the House has ordered.

Mr. BINGHAM. Oh, the gentleman knows it can be amended. He can vote it down. The matter is before the House. There is no impropriety in moving to amend the report of the committee.

Mr. HEPBURN. But I understand the gentleman to submit a report from the Committee on Appropriations which was directed by the House. He now says he submits that report, but he says at the same time that he makes a submission, as he calls it, of a verbal report, amending the original report. In other words, one report is for and the other against. He tells this House that the latter proposition has been unanimously recommended by the committee, although it is directly in opposition to the report the committee was directed to make by the House.

Mr. BINGHAM. If the gentleman objects to my making the report the committee authorizes, the gentleman knows that the matter is subject to amendment, and if he objects to it of course he can vote against it.

Mr. HEPBURN (from his seat). I presumed that might be done. [Laughter.]

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing inconsistent in the action of the Committee on Appropriations, and I hope I may be excused for saying a word just here as to this matter.

As the acting chairman of the committee [Mr. BINGHAM] has stated, the report of the committee on this resolution is strictly in accordance with the instructions of the House. But he was instructed by the committee to suggest to the House when the

report was submitted the impropriety of striking out the provision for the inauguration of the Vice-President. The committee thought the House intended by its action to assert its right to be consulted about these ceremonies, and that if this should be admitted there would be no objection to leaving the Vice-President in the resolution. In my opinion there is no good reason why he should be omitted; and now, when the resolution is back, the House, if it desires to amend it so that in the joint inaugural ceremonies the Vice-President may be included, can do so.

The committee has performed its duty and complied with the instruction of the House. The House can take such steps as it may desire on the report as presented. The committee, however, does not consider it improper to suggest that the House ought not to adhere to the amendment which expressly eliminates the Vice-President and treats him simply as an officer of the Senate. He is more than that. He is to be Vice-President of the United States, and by virtue of this great office is President of the Senate.

As one member of the committee, and a member of the House, I believe that it would be highly improper and discourteous to the Vice-President-elect to refuse to embody the provision for his inauguration ceremonies, under the joint control of the Senate and House, if we are to have any at all.

I think that so much of the amendment as proposes to strike out the Vice-President should be voted down.

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL].

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, the main purpose that I had in mind when I moved to recommit the resolution that came from the Committee on Appropriations was to secure a recognition of the House of Representatives on the part of the Senate. In other words, I supposed that I was securing what belongs to us as of right. The suggestion was made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] that the inauguration of the President of the Senate was no necessary part of the inauguration of the President of the United States, and I fell in with that view, and it so seemed to me at the time.

Since that time, however, a great many gentlemen have come to me and suggested that it would be impossible to separate the two, the inauguration of the President and the inauguration of the Vice-President; that it was all one ceremony, and I consequently said so to my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] when he submitted that resolution to me and told me of the suggestion made by the Committee on Appropriations. I assented to his making the statement to the House that I assented to that as reasonable, and was willing that the sense of the House might be secured on that point.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks a separate vote had probably better be taken on each of these amendments. The Clerk will report the first amendment.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I want to demand a separate vote on each of the amendments.

The SPEAKER. A separate vote is demanded. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN]?

Mr. BINGHAM. I do.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I differ with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] in the statement that he has made that these two functions are inseparable.

Mr. DALZELL. I said it was so represented to me. I expressed no opinion about it.

Mr. HEPBURN. Then it is the idea of somebody else that I want to controvert?

Mr. DALZELL. Quite a number of gentlemen made the suggestion.

Mr. HEPBURN. In my judgment the two things are entirely distinct. The one pertains to the presiding officer of the Senate. It has the same relation to the inauguration of the President of the United States that the induction of our honored Speaker has to that event. The President of the United States has no participation whatever, necessarily, in that function, and his inauguration would be as complete anywhere else. Three times, I remind you, a President of the United States has been inducted into office, clothed with all of his functions and powers, when the Senate of the United States was not in session, and when there was not any attempt to secure their cooperation.

Mr. BINGHAM. The same condition occurred with President Arthur.

Mr. HEPBURN. Their presence is absolutely unnecessary, as completely so as would be the presence of the House. Now, they propose that we participate in the inauguration of the Vice-President, their presiding officer, and in the inauguration of the President. I care nothing about the inauguration of the Vice-President, any more than a Senator would care about the inauguration of the Speaker of the House. I am interested, and we all are, in the inauguration of the President, an event that takes

place in an entirely different place, at a different time, under entirely different circumstances, and that has no relation whatever to the inauguration of the Vice-President. We are interested in the former; we are not in the latter.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will the gentleman allow a suggestion?

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. BINGHAM. The special place and the mode of proceeding in connection with the inauguration of the Vice-President of the United States in the Senate Chamber, as well as the ceremonies in connection with the inauguration of the President of the United States at the east front of the Capitol, have no existence in statute in any form whatever.

Mr. HEPBURN. That is very true.

Mr. BINGHAM. They are functions and ceremonies for which a committee such as is now suggested will make all arrangements. These functions are wholly beyond the statute and only exist as a committee of arrangements may determine under resolution of the two Houses.

Mr. HEPBURN. That is exactly as I understand it, and therefore I think there is no necessity of including in any way any provision for the inauguration of the Vice-President in this legislation. Let us attend to those matters that pertain to us, in which we have an interest, and that are our business, or may be.

Mr. HOPKINS. Now, will the gentleman allow a question right there?

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. HOPKINS. Would it not be a proper courtesy to extend to the incoming Vice-President?

Mr. HEPBURN. What courtesy?

Mr. HOPKINS. To have the House attend in a body to witness the ceremony of his induction into office?

Mr. HEPBURN. If the House is willing to go through with the scenes we have been familiar with, and within the knowledge of myself and every other member for a long time connected with this House. We are invited, it is true, but treated with contempt and indignity; and my refusal to further participate is because of the contempt that has been shown this House time and again.

We are invited there and find no provision for us. Time and again members of the House have gone there, two and three hundred strong, and found that fifty or sixty could be seated, a hundred or more could be permitted to stand up in the corners of the Chamber, and the balance of them wait in the corridors until the Vice-President was inaugurated and it was time to begin the ceremonies of the inauguration of the President.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. BINGHAM. I have no doubt of the correctness of the gentleman's statement that there have been occasions when members of the House have been greatly inconvenienced in attending the functions in the Senate; but when we are proceeding to legislative action, in taking cognizance of all that pertains and surrounds the inauguration of the President of the United States, is it wise to completely ignore an attendance upon the installation of the Vice-President?

Mr. HEPBURN. I say so, absolutely, upon the part of this House. It is none of our business to be there while they inaugurate their President.

Mr. BINGHAM. We are making it our business. Let me say this to the gentleman. The gentleman well knows that when the Speaker's gavel falls at 12 o'clock on the 4th day of March we are simply citizens of the United States, and the only standing we can have in the participation of the ceremonies pertaining to the inauguration of the President of the United States is determined through this character of legislation, when we are in existence, and not after the 4th of March, when we are legislatively dead.

Mr. HEPBURN. I appreciate that; and how do you remedy it? By concurrent resolution. That ends with the 4th of March. Do you prolong the existence of the membership of this House by your concurrent resolution?

Mr. BINGHAM. Oh, yes.

Mr. HEPBURN. If you will have a joint resolution and make it law, then you so project the life of your committee into the future that it has that power after 12 o'clock on the 4th of March.

Mr. BINGHAM. If the gentleman wants to discuss—

Mr. HEPBURN (continuing). What are your committee but private citizens at the time you propose they shall participate? They are simply private citizens, and they have no standing in this matter except by the grace of the Senate. But if you pass a joint resolution and make it law, that extends the official life of these gentlemen as a committee.

Mr. BINGHAM. When we come to the concurrent resolution, I will submit to the House why it is a concurrent resolution; and the appointment of this committee follows the precedents. If the gentleman will permit me, I will submit it now. It has been contended, and the contention has been made both in the House and in the Senate, that the President has no right to participate in the

organization of either House of Congress, and it is therefore improper to provide for a committee of either House, or the two Houses, other than in a resolution or a concurrent resolution, which does not go to the President for his sanction. Now, on that the precedents are all in the shape of a concurrent resolution. I ask, Mr. Speaker, for the consideration of the amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

In line 3, after the word "Senate," insert the words "and Clerk of the House of Representatives."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now report the second amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 5 strike out the word "Vice-President."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Speaker, before that amendment is voted on, I desire to say a word. If the House wants to participate in the inauguration of the Vice-President, if we want to join in this ceremony, we will leave the word "Vice-President" in. I am satisfied it was not the intention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, nor the intention of the House yesterday, to strike out the word "Vice-President."

The contention of the House was that we should be recognized in the inauguration ceremonies on the east front of the Capitol, and that they should be in charge of a joint committee of the House and the Senate, and that the Senate alone should not conduct these ceremonies. There is no question but that that was the intention of the House yesterday, and if we vote down this amendment, the President and Vice-President will be inaugurated under the direction of the joint committee of the House and Senate.

Now, as to the contention that the House is not fairly treated in these ceremonies, I have these figures to submit. It is well known that the Members of the House are allowed two tickets each to the ceremony in the Senate. The Senators have four each. In other words, the Senators have 360 and the House has 714. That is for the galleries of the Senate. The Members of the House have 714 tickets to distribute to their constituents, while the Senators only have 360 tickets.

Then, when we come to the platform out here, those who are in the Senate Chamber come out and go onto the central platform and occupy the seats on that platform. The House has 714 tickets to give out, while only 360 seats are given out by the Senate for seats on this central platform. In addition to that, the members of the House are seated on the platform, and the members-elect are seated on the platform. So by any system of figuring you can go through the House of Representatives has two-thirds of the seats on the central platform.

In addition to that, it is proposed by this resolution to build another platform that will seat 2,100 people for the House, and give to the members of the House something over five tickets each or about six tickets each that they can give out to their constituents. We shall have a platform on this side of the central platform, and the Senate will have a platform on their side. Now, that seems to me a perfectly fair arrangement.

Why should this House say that we will not participate in the inauguration ceremonies of a Vice-President? We all know the Vice-President is more than a presiding officer of the Senate. He may become the President of the United States; he was elected by the people of the United States. The House of Representatives ought not to say that it will not take part in the inauguration of a Vice-President of the United States, and do something that no Congress ever did in the history of the United States. Now, simply vote down this amendment, and we will take part in the inauguration of the Vice-President. In order to leave the words in, this amendment which is now proposed ought to be voted down, and I hope the House will vote it down.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment just reported by the Clerk.

The question was taken; and the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now read the next amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

In line 6, after the word "with," strike out all down to and including the word "hundred," in line 9, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Such programme as may be adopted by a joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, to be appointed under a concurrent resolution of the two Houses."

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 12, strike out the word "five" and insert the word "seven."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time; and being read the third time, it was passed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now read the amendment in reference to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to enable the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States on March 4, 1901."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the title will be amended, and so as to include the words "Vice-President."

There was no objection.

On motion of Mr. BINGHAM, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I now offer the following concurrent resolution:

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That a joint committee consisting of three Senators and three Representatives, to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, is authorized to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice-President of the United States on the 4th day of March, next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. BINGHAM, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I ask unanimous consent of the House, as in Committee of the Whole, to consider the urgent deficiency bill, which has been sent to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the urgent deficiency bill, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I hope the gentleman will not insist on bringing that up now. It is now quarter past 5 o'clock.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. If it takes over three minutes I will withdraw it. It is a unanimous report of the committee.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Is there any necessity for its passing this evening?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Great necessity. Unless this bill becomes a law by next Friday, work which is of great convenience to the public will have to stop.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13599) to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for transcripts of records and plats in the General Land Office.

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of \$9,350 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply a deficiency in the appropriation made for the fiscal year 1901, for furnishing transcripts of records and plats, General Land Office, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior: Provided, That copyists employed under this appropriation shall be selected by the Secretary of the Interior at a compensation of \$2 per day while actually employed, at such times and for such periods as exigencies of the work may demand.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Just a word of explanation. This bill is to continue an appropriation which runs in the current law. It provides for furnishing transcripts of plats and records from the General Land Office as they are called for by the public, the applicants paying more than the cost to the Government.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. It is a unanimous report?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Yes, sir; the appropriation has run out. The force engaged upon this work will have to be discharged unless this bill be passed.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill; which was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 5395. An act to authorize the United New Jersey Railroad and Canal Company and the Philadelphia and Trenton Railroad Company, or their successors, to construct and maintain a bridge across the Delaware River—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 5549. An act granting an increase of pension to Horatio N. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5019. An act granting an increase of pension to Julia Crenshaw—to the Committee on Pensions.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. BUTLER, for the balance of the week, on account of important business.

To Mr. DINSMORE, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. PUGH, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the following cases, there having been no adverse report:

Ann Stewart, administratrix of William Stewart (H. R. 6535).
 Thomas C. Isgrigg (H. R. 6540).
 J. B. McClintock (H. R. 6538).
 Marcus L. Broadwell's administrator (H. R. 6539).
 James S. Frizzell (H. R. 6537).
 Thomas V. Stirman's estate (H. R. 6536).

And then, on motion of Mr. DALZELL (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Navy submitting an additional estimate of appropriation for construction and repairs of vessels—to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and law in the French spoliation claims of the brig *Betsey*, George R. Turner, master, against the United States—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting deficiencies in appropriations for the service of the Patent Office—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Commissary-General of Subsistence, papers relating to reimbursement of Lieut. S. J. B. Schindel for loss of United States funds by burglary—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13236) granting a pension to James Barton, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2335); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12473) granting an increase of pension to E. Bradford Gay, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2336); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11395) granting a pension to Sarah J. Binnix, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2337); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GASTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9005) granting an increase of pension to William W. Schooley, of Plymouth, Pa., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2338); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9584) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. Bell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2339); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GASTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11085) granting a pension to Mary M. Sprandel, widow of Julius Sprandel, deceased, late a first lieutenant of engineers, Pennsylvania Volunteers, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2340); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13088) granting an increase of pension to Peter Brunette, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2341); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13049) granting a pension to Elizabeth

Fury, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2342); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10995) granting a pension to William Mitchell, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2343); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1203) granting an increase of pension to Lewis S. Horsey, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2344); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3750) granting a pension to Paulina Smith, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2345); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3881) granting an increase of pension to Henry D. Johnson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2346); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CONNER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3338) granting a pension to Mary A. Morton, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2347); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5192) granting an increase of pension to Richard O. Greenleaf, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2348); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4788) granting an increase of pension to George P. Beach, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2349); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CONNER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2228) granting an increase of pension to Oliver W. Miller, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2350); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2226) granting an increase of pension to Henry Muhs, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2351); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4841) granting an increase of pension to George A. Parker, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2352); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CONNER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2109) granting an increase of pension to Carroll W. Fuller, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2353); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2621) granting an increase of pension to Charles Frye, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2354); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HENRY of Mississippi, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill H. R. 13581, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 366) for the relief of Charlotte Spears, accompanied by a report (No. 2355); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WEEKS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6032) for the relief of David V. Howell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2356); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BAILEY of Kansas, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12554) for the relief of James M. Chisham, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2357); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. HULL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the resolution of the House (H. Res. 315) regarding the action of General Chaffee in China, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 2358); which said bill and report were ordered to lie on the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13504) for the relief of Catherine Pflueger, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LINNEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 13600) to prevent the assignment of clerks to duty as exhibitors at any exposition—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 13601) to prevent overhead wires within the fire limits of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 13602) enlarging and defining the jurisdiction of the United States district court for Porto Rico—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 13603) to provide for two additional associate justices of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROMWELL: A bill (H. R. 13604) to create a Railway Mail Service relief fund—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. O'GRADY: A bill (H. R. 13605) to amend the immigration laws of the United States relative to the insane, idiotic, or epileptic—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DAVIS: A bill (H. R. 13606) authorizing the establishment of a light signal at or near Hillsboro Point, Florida—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OTEY: A bill (H. R. 13607) to provide additional force at the workhouse and the almshouse, District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 13608) for the extension of Seventeenth street to the Walbridge subdivision of Ingleside—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILSON of Arizona: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 296) to authorize certain officers of Treasury Department to audit, certify, and pay claims of certain counties of Arizona—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 13609) to incorporate the Society of American Florists and Ornamental Horticulturists—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICK: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 69) directing the printing and binding of 15,000 copies of the records and all the arguments and briefs in the cases of John H. Goetze vs. The United States, etc.—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A resolution (H. Res. 367) authorizing the Clerk of the House to pay Jesse G. Bunnell extra pay for extra services—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 13610) for the benefit of Jane Day—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: A bill (H. R. 13611) for the relief of the heirs of James Billiu, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13612) for the relief of the estate of Francois Lagleize, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COONEY: A bill (H. R. 13613) granting an increase of pension to A. J. Green—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13614) granting a pension to B. Sappington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13615) granting an increase of pension to William H. Price—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13616) granting an increase of pension to W. W. Donhan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROMER: A bill (H. R. 13617) granting an increase of pension to George W. Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREER: A bill (H. R. 13618) granting a pension to Mary Elizabeth Hawk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13619) granting a pension to Henry King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 13620) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of Thomas F. Adams—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HALL: A bill (H. R. 13621) granting an increase of pension to James P. Burchfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 13622) granting a pension to Silas H. Cronk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 13623) to amend "An act to incorporate the Masonic Mutual Relief Association of the District of Columbia"—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SNODGRASS: A bill (H. R. 13624) granting a pension to Stephen D. Hamilton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13625) to correct military record of Calvin Smith, deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEYMOUTH: A bill (H. R. 13626) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against John Milan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 13627) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of Jerry Horan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 13628) for the relief of the estate of F. L. Hammond, deceased, late of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13629) to authorize the Secretary of War to cause to be investigated and to provide for the payment of the claim of the Florence Masonic Lodge, of Florence, Ala., for the destruction of their buildings for Government purposes by the United States military authorities during the late war, and all claims for damages resulting from the appropriation to Government use of any of the furnishings or materials pertaining to said buildings, and for damage to said buildings—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RIDGELY: A bill (H. R. 13630) granting a pension to Emma M. Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BROMWELL: Petitions and memorials from the following posts of the Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of House bill No. 5779, granting preference to soldiers and sailors of the civil war for appointments in the Government service; which were referred to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, viz:

Alabama—Post No. 15.
Arkansas—Posts Nos. 14, 19, 23, 27, 45.
California and Nevada—Posts Nos. 1, 4, 5, 7, 17, 20, 23, 33, 34, 45, 48, 49, 54, 55, 56, 82, 88, 93, 103, 118, 124, 126, 127, 140, 141, 169, 171, 177, 179.
Colorado and Wyoming—Posts Nos. 2, 4, 8, 12, 39, 42, 46, 47, 49, 70, 76, 81, 85, 96, 99, 100, 102.
Connecticut—Posts Nos. 1, 2, 8, 9, 17, 18, 23, 33, 36, 39, 48, 49, 53, 56, 67, 76, 78.
Delaware—Posts Nos. 2, 3, 5, 23.
District of Columbia—Posts Nos. 1, 6, 7, 9, 15.
Florida—Posts Nos. 20, 21.
Illinois—Posts Nos. 5, 7, 9, 28, 30, 40, 45, 49, 55, 67, 70, 75, 80, 81, 86, 88, 91, 98, 106, 109, 120, 121, 128, 135, 140, 149, 162, 153, 164, 169, 186, 195, 198, 203, 209, 243, 244, 251, 257, 263, 265, 272, 274, 278, 282, 283, 291, 299, 311, 325, 339, 342, 354, 358, 373, 384, 392, 404, 405, 409, 411, 414, 424, 437, 439, 445, 447, 460, 461, 471, 480, 494, 497, 502, 513, 525, 526, 534, 535, 540, 546, 551, 555, 560, 561, 573, 586, 587, 604, 616, 626, 628, 641, 666, 667, 668, 672, 682, 706, 729, 743, 751, 760, 774, 779, 780, 785, 788, 790, 792.
Indian Territory—Posts Nos. 2, 5, 21, 25.
Idaho—Posts Nos. 21, 27.
Iowa—Posts Nos. 19, 20, 22, 29, 33, 40, 56, 71, 78, 88, 94, 97, 98, 100, 101, 103, 110, 117, 130, 139, 147, 165, 168, 171, 181, 190, 193, 194, 208, 211, 216, 241, 347, 348, 369, 371, 391, 400, 408, 466, 479, 497, 515.
Kansas—Post Nos. 5, 6, 12, 14, 17, 35, 36, 43, 45, 47, 49, 53, 55, 65, 68, 72, 75, 83, 90, 92, 93, 100, 112, 113, 142, 153, 156, 187, 200, 206, 238, 240, 242, 252, 262, 265, 266, 267, 297, 303, 305, 348, 350, 353, 379, 398, 409, 422, 427, 435, 443, 456, 463, 464, 468, 482, 493.
Kentucky—Posts Nos. 2, 11, 20, 21, 33, 39, 56, 57, 70, 83, 156, 178.
Maine—Posts Nos. 2, 15, 22, 28, 36, 102, 111, 122, 153.
Massachusetts—Posts Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 17, 19, 20, 22, 24, 29, 30, 32, 37, 38, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 60, 62, 64, 67, 71, 74, 81, 82, 85, 88, 89, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 106, 110, 111, 114, 115, 117, 121, 123, 131, 132, 133, 139, 140, 141, 149, 153, 157, 164, 166, 173, 174, 181, 184, 190, 191, 193, 196, 197, 199, 200, 204, 206, 208, 210.
Minnesota—Posts Nos. 8, 20, 54, 57, 68, 72, 76, 87, 92, 103, 107, 119, 147, 151, 157, 186.
Mississippi and Louisiana—Posts Nos. 6, 12, 14, 15, 20, 24, 25, 35, 43, 46, 48, 49.
Maryland—Posts Nos. 1, 6, 7, 29, 31, 49, 65, 67, 70, 72.
Michigan—Posts Nos. 1, 5, 6, 9, 11, 14, 31, 35, 37, 38, 42, 43, 45, 56, 60, 62, 66, 67, 72, 84, 87, 88, 89, 90, 96, 108, 110, 111, 119, 121, 125, 126, 128, 132, 133, 141, 149, 152, 156, 158, 160, 162, 166, 167, 168, 181, 182, 205, 210, 212, 218, 233, 235, 252, 255, 257, 258, 261, 262, 274, 280, 281, 283, 294, 300, 316, 326, 341, 343, 348, 351, 357, 365, 372, 377, 393, 395, 398, 408, 416, 425, 439, 445, 448.

Missouri—Posts Nos. 2, 4, 13, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 26, 29, 30, 34, 39, 42, 53, 59, 69, 78, 107, 110, 115, 124, 141, 158, 171, 177, 190, 194, 197, 214, 219, 220, 247, 251, 257, 271, 282, 316, 320, 322, 332, 352, 358, 377, 383, 387, 391, 393, 424, 429, 437, 458, 466, 488, 514, 544, 549, 569.

New Hampshire—Posts Nos. 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 16, 17, 29, 46, 57, 64, 71, 72, 85, 86.

Nebraska—Posts Nos. 8, 11, 13, 18, 19, 24, 34, 61, 64, 77, 84, 89, 94, 95, 120, 132, 165, 177, 323.

New Jersey—Posts Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 26, 27, 29, 34, 37, 43, 45, 46, 55, 64, 71, 73, 79, 83, 85, 103, 107, 11, 113, 118.

New Mexico—Posts Nos. 2, 3.

New York—Posts Nos. 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 17, 18, 20, 21, 24, 28, 29, 30, 41, 42, 43, 44, 47, 52, 55, 60, 62, 67, 69, 75, 79, 80, 81, 83, 88, 89, 96, 104, 106, 109, 110, 111, 113, 117, 118, 121, 122, 130, 132, 135, 136, 141, 143, 148, 151, 156, 160, 162, 166, 179, 182, 185, 195, 197, 202, 206, 209, 212, 217, 219, 221, 222, 230, 231, 233, 237, 239, 240, 247, 251, 254, 255, 264, 269, 276, 279, 281, 283, 294, 299, 301, 307, 309, 315, 326, 327, 330, 333, 335, 342, 345, 354, 361, 366, 369, 371, 378, 389, 392, 393, 394, 399, 400, 402, 408, 409, 421, 422, 423, 427, 432, 435, 436, 442, 449, 451, 458, 471, 494, 496, 500, 516, 527, 529, 532, 539, 552, 559, 565, 578, 584, 585, 607, 623, 628, 630, 644, 650, 653, 656, 669.

North Dakota—Posts Nos. 2, 6, 7, 12, 15, 24, 38.

Ohio—Posts Nos. 1, 4, 5, 7, 12, 13, 14, 19, 21, 22, 25, 28, 36, 47, 54, 60, 67, 78, 79, 97, 103, 113, 117, 130, 137, 156, 158, 159, 162, 178, 182, 186, 187, 194, 195, 202, 204, 220, 222, 225, 232, 241, 249, 250, 251, 252, 277, 283, 310, 327, 332, 350, 352, 355, 368, 369, 384, 389, 422, 426, 435, 482, 487, 537, 565, 568, 579, 599.

Oklahoma—Posts Nos. 3, 40.

Oregon—Posts Nos. 6, 7, 13, 36, 70, 75.

Pennsylvania—Posts Nos. 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 22, 24, 28, 30, 31, 37, 39, 42, 44, 46, 47, 50, 51, 58, 59, 61, 62, 67, 68, 71, 73, 76, 78, 79, 84, 88, 90, 91, 96, 97, 98, 99, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 122, 123, 124, 130, 137, 140, 144, 146, 149, 151, 155, 159, 170, 179, 181, 182, 189, 203, 214, 215, 216, 217, 225, 226, 228, 232, 237, 246, 250, 256, 259, 275, 290, 293, 297, 308, 309, 311, 312, 336, 350, 357, 363, 366, 383, 400, 405, 406, 407, 452, 475, 476, 480, 494, 495, 502, 511, 527, 537, 569, 571, 576, 582.

Rhode Island—Posts Nos. 4, 6, 7, 10, 15, 17, 19, 24, 26.

South Dakota—Posts Nos. 7, 9, 13, 15, 17, 19, 62, 81, 89, 108, 127.

Texas—Posts Nos. 1, 3, 4, 10, 11, 19, 53, 78, 96.

Tennessee—Posts Nos. 1, 20, 21, 28, 40, 50, 67.

Utah—Posts Nos. 1, 3, 5, 6, 7.

Virginia and North Carolina—Posts Nos. 7, 14, 22, 33, 44, 47, 50, 53, 61.

Vermont—Posts Nos. 4, 6, 7, 13, 18, 26, 47, 60, 72, 98, 108, 111, 114, 116, 117.

West Virginia—Post No. 46.

Washington and Alaska—Posts Nos. 1, 2, 16, 22, 46, 47, 48, 64, 89, 90, 95, 99, 100.

Wisconsin—Posts Nos. 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 17, 19, 20, 25, 33, 42, 44, 47, 50, 74, 83, 86, 87, 91, 94, 95, 98, 102, 109, 116, 126, 127, 147, 151, 157, 207, 208, 212, 213, 247, 261.

Montreal, Canada—Post No. 105.

By Mr. BULL: Petitions of keepers and surfmen of Point Judith, Block Island, and Narragansett Pier (R. I.) life-saving stations, for the passage of bill to promote the efficiency of Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of citizens of Pittsburg and vicinity, State of Pennsylvania, favoring the exclusion of alcoholic liquor from Africa and all countries inhabited chiefly by native races—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: Paper to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to William H. Leavell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: Petition of the Merchants' Exchange of Charleston, S. C., praying that the operations of the United States Geological Survey be extended so as to include the forests of South Carolina and the Eastern States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of the Merchants' Exchange of Charleston, S. C., praying that an appropriation be made to carry on the work of the Geological Survey relative to the water power of the country for manufacturing and other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of the Merchants' Exchange of Charleston, S. C., praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the public roads of the country—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Merchants' Exchange of Charleston, S. C., praying for the establishment of a national forest reserve—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FREER: Petition of Henry King, also affidavits, to accompany House bill granting him a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of William M. Cheuvront, of Wirt County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Petition of C. A. Stanton and other business firms of Madison, Ind., for the repeal of the tax of 15 per

cent ad valorem on imported hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Petitions of letter carriers of Benton Harbor, St. Joseph, and Dowagiac, Mich., in favor of the letter carriers' salary bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Petition of A. W. Smith and 51 other citizens of Richmond, Me., against the parcels-post system—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition of citizens of the State of New Jersey, in favor of the anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution and certain other measures—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUDD: Petition of Joshua Jones, of Calvert County, Md., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SCUDDER: Protest of citizens of Greenport, Long Island, against the establishment of the parcels-post system—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: Papers in support of House bill No. 11274, for the relief of George L. Neafus, of Meade County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. YOUNG: Resolutions of the National Wholesale Druggists' Association, opposing the free distribution of medicinal remedies—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Farragut Association, Naval Veterans, of the port of Philadelphia, Pa., for the passage of Senate bill No. 3422, an act to equalize the rank and pay of certain retired officers of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of C. L. Shaffer and other railway postal clerks of the State of Illinois, favoring the bill for the reclassification of the Railway Mail Service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of H. K. Mulford Company, Philadelphia, Pa., advocating governmental aid to shipping, and the passage at this session of some measure that will accomplish this purpose—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Grand Army of the Republic Association of Philadelphia County, Pa., in favor of the passage of House bill granting an increase of pension to Col. Charles L. Leiper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 17, 1901.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. PENROSE, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to say to those present, especially in the galleries, that under the rules of the Senate no applause and no evidences of disapprobation are permitted.

Mr. PENROSE. I rise to a question of privilege. I present the credentials of Hon. Matthew S. Quay as a duly elected Senator from the State of Pennsylvania, and ask that they be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the credentials.

The Secretary read the credentials of Matthew Stanley Quay, chosen by the legislature of the State of Pennsylvania a Senator from that State for the balance of the constitutional term which began March 4, 1899.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials will be placed on file.

Mr. PENROSE. I ask that Hon. Matthew S. Quay be now permitted to take the oath of office.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator-elect will present himself at the desk to take the necessary oath.

Mr. Quay was escorted to the Vice-President's desk by Mr. PENROSE, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

REPORTS ON ALASKA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Director of the Geological Survey recommending the passage of a resolution providing for the printing of 15,000 copies of the reports on Alaska, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.